Sampling and Distortion Tradeoffs for Bandlimited Periodic Signals

Elaheh Mohammadi and Farokh Marvasti
Advanced Communications Research Institute (ACRI)
Department of Electrical Engineering
Sharif University of Technology

arXiv:1405.3980v3 [cs.IT] 13 Mar 2015

Abstract

In this paper, the optimal sampling strategies (uniform or nonuniform) and distortion tradeoffs for stationary Gaussian bandlimited periodic signals with additive white Gaussian noise are studied. Unlike the previous works that commonly consider the average distortion as the performance criterion, we justify and use both the average and variance of distortion as the performance criteria. To compute the optimal distortion, one needs to find the optimal sampling locations, as well as the optimal pre-sampling filter. A complete characterization of optimal distortion for the rates lower than half the Landau rate is provided. It is shown that nonuniform sampling outperforms uniform sampling. In addition, this nonuniform sampling is robust with respect to missing sampling values. Next, for the rates higher than half the Landau rate, we find bounds that are shown to be tight for some special cases. An extension of the results for random discrete periodic signals is discussed, with simulation results indicating that the intuitions from the continuous domain carry over to the discrete domain. Sparse signals are also considered where it is shown that uniform sampling is optimal above the Nyquist rate. Finally, we consider a sampling/quantization scheme for compressing the signal. Here, we show that the total distortion can be expressed as the sum of sampling and quantization distortions. This implies a lower bound on the distortion via Shannon's rate distortion theorem.

1 Introduction

Shannon's rate distortion theory finds the optimal compression rate for a given distortion for an i.i.d. discrete signal. For continuous signals, Shannon assumes that the signal is sampled at the Nyquist rate. Thus, in Shannon's protocol, distortion occurs at the quantization phase; no information about the signal is discarded in the sampling phase. But since only the end-to-end distortion is of importance, one can accept some distortion at the sampling phase, by sampling the signal below the Nyquist rate. In other words, we can discard information about the signal in both the sampling and quantization phases. This has the benefit of saving in the sampling rate, which can improve power and computational efficiency of the system [1, 2]. Furthermore, choosing the sampling locations (*nonuniform sampling*), one can further reduce the sampling rate.

Nonuniform sampling works by measuring signal values at a set of arbitrary locations in time. This can occur when we are either unable to uniformly sample the signal due to some physical constraints, or when we lose some of the samples after uniform sampling. Furthermore, nonuniform sampling is helpful in dealing with aliasing [3], even though characterizing "the effective bandwidth" under nonuniform sampling is difficult. Similar to uniform sampling, it has been shown that for reliable recovery, the average sampling rate must be at least twice the bandwidth of the signal [4]. See [5] for an overview of nonuniform sampling.

Consider the problem of finding the best locations for sampling a continuous signal to minimize the reconstruction distortion. To find the optimal sampling points, one should utilize any available prior information about the structure of the signal. Furthermore, sampling noise should be taken into account. Due to its importance, nonuniform sampling and its stability analysis has been the subject of numerous works. However, there has been relatively less work for a fully Bayesian model of the signal and sampling noise, where one is interested in the statistical *average* distortion of signal reconstruction over a class of signals. In this paper, we study this problem for stationary periodic bandlimited signals.

Previous works: While there has been some previous work on the tradeoffs between sampling rate, quantization of samples and reconstruction distortion [6]-[12]; there has been relatively fewer papers on finding the best locations of nonuniform sampling for minimizing reconstruction distortion [17]-[19].

The best locations of nonuniform sampling via an *adaptive sampling* method is considered in [1] for a first order Markov source. They propose a new framework based on dynamic programming and greedy methods to compute the sampling time increments using the m most recent sampling times and values. A tradeoff among sampling rate, information rate and distortion of uniform sampling is derived in [7] for Gaussian sources corrupted by noise. One major difference between the assumptions in [7] and ours is that they looks at uniform sampling while we consider both uniform and nonuniform sampling. The authors in [8] look at choosing the

sampling points for a stationary Gaussian signal with auto-correlation function $R(\tau) = \rho^{|\tau|}$. It is shown that uniform sampling is optimal in this case. Matthews [9] considers a wide-sense stationary process, and computes the linear MMSE estimate from sub-Nyquist uniform samples. The authors in [10] compute the optimal pre- and post-filters for a signal corrupted by noise, when uniform sampling is used. The problem is formulated in such a way that it is applicable to different types of modulation systems such as PAM, PCM and DPCM. The authors in [11] derive a rate distortion function for lossy reconstruction of a multi-component signal, when only a subset of the signal components are sampled.

There has been some work in compressed sensing on the tradeoffs between the number of samples and the reconstruction error. Here the samples are linear measurements, and the goal is to recover the sparsity pattern with a given distortion level. In [6], a sampling rate-distortion region is found; it is shown that arbitrarily small but constant distortion is achievable with a constant measurement rate and per-sample signal-to-noise ratio. The authors in [12] define a sampling-rate distortion function for an i.i.d. source, and derive lower bounds on the achievable performance. Application of the sampling-rate distortion framework to compressed imaging with a multi-resolution statistical image model are also considered.

Computing optimal sampling points when limited information about the signal is available, has also been considered in the literature. A *universal* set of sampling points for a class of signals is one that allows reliable reconstruction, uniformly for all signals in this class. In [13], a class of discrete signals with a limited number of non-zero frequency components are considered, and universal sampling locations are specified.

Finally, the problem of finding optimal sampling points is a task of general importance and has been studied in miscellaneous applications, e.g. [14]-[19].

System Model: In this paper, we consider a continuous stationary periodic signal. The signal is assumed to be bandlimited, with at most $2(N_2 - N_1 + 1)$ non-zero Fourier series coefficients from frequency $N_1\omega_0$ to $N_2\omega_0$ where $\omega_0 = 2\pi/T$ is the fundamental frequency. Since there are $2N \triangleq 2(N_2 - N_1 + 1)$ free variables, the signal can be uniquely reconstructed from $M = 2N$ noiseless samples (Landau rate). But as we consider taking M *noisy* samples (at time instances that we choose), unique reconstruction is not feasible, and distortion is inevitable. We also consider a pre-sampling filter in our model. See Fig. 1 for a description of our problem.

The Fourier series coefficients and the sampling noise are all random variables. Therefore, both the input signal and its reconstruction from its samples are random signals, and so is the reconstruction distortion. One measure of fidelity is the expected value of distortion. Another measure is the probability that the distortion exceeds a certain threshold; this probability will be small if both the expectation and variance of the reconstruction distortion are small. In this paper, we consider minimizing both the expected value and variance of distortion, by choosing the best sampling points and the pre-sampling filter. We denote the minimum of the expected value and variance of distortion by $\mathsf{D}_{\min}$ and $\mathsf{V}_{\min}$, respectively. A small $\mathsf{D}_{\min}$ guarantees a good *average* performance over all instances of the random signal, while a small $\mathsf{V}_{\min}$ guarantees that with high probability, we are close to the promised average distortion for a given random signal (see also Appendix A for further justification). In essence, our goal is to find the tradeoffs between the number of samples (M), the pre-sampling filter, the variance of noise (σ^2) and the optimal expected value and the variance of distortion ($\mathsf{D}_{\min}$ and $\mathsf{V}_{\min}$). The literature in sampling theory looks only at minimizing the average distortion and ignores the variance of distortion.

Overview of Main Contributions: We provide tight results or bounds on the tradeoffs among various parameters such as distortion, sampling rate and sampling noise.

When we are below half the Landau rate, $M \leq N$, we find the optimal average distortion ($\mathsf{D}_{\min}$) and variance ($\mathsf{V}_{\min}$). Interestingly, we show that the minimum of both $\mathsf{D}_{\min}$ and $\mathsf{V}_{\min}$ are obtained at the same sampling locations and the same pre-sampling filter. These two minima are obtained when we use no pre-sampling filter on the signal bandwidth, and use a nonuniform sampling procedure as given below: any arbitrary M points from the set $\{0, T/N, 2T/N, 3T/N, \cdots, (N-1)T/N\}$, which are uniform sampling points at <u>half</u> the Landau rate. Observe that for $M < N$, this is a non-uniform set of sampling points. It is worth to note that the sampling locations only depend on the bandwidth of the signal; they are optimal for all values of the noise variance (σ^2) and N_1. Moreover, the sampling points are robust with respect to missing samples. Note that the optimal sampling points are any arbitrary M points from the set $\{0, T/N, 2T/N, 3T/N, \cdots, (N-1)T/N\}$. Thus, if we sample at these positions and we miss some samples, *i.e.,* getting $M' < M$ samples instead of M samples, the set of M' sample points is still a subset of $\{0, T/N, 2T/N, 3T/N, \cdots, (N-1)T/N\}$, and hence optimal. Therefore, if we knew in advance that we get M' samples, this knowledge would not have helped us. Finally, complete characterization of distortion in terms of M and σ^2, allows us to answer the question of whether it is better to collect a few accurate samples from a signal, or collect many inaccurate samples from the same signal (a similar question has been raised in [7]).

For rates above half the Landau rate, we provide lower and upper bounds that are shown to be tight in some cases. When $N < M \leq 2N$, *i.e.,* between half the Landau rate and the Landau rate, we find optimal average distortion when $N|2N_1 - 1$, using a non-uniform set of sampling locations. In addition, when $M > 2N$, uniform sampling is shown to be optimal under certain constraints. Whenever we find $\mathsf{D}_{\min}$ and $\mathsf{V}_{\min}$ explicitly,

Notation	Description
T, ω_0	T is signal period and $\omega_0 = 2\pi/T$
A_ℓ, B_ℓ	Fourier series coefficients of the original signal $\ell \in [N_1 : N_2]$
p	average signal power in each frequency
N, N_1 and N_2	The support of the input signal in frequency domain is from $N_1\omega_0$ to $N_2\omega_0$. $N = N_2 - N_1 + 1$. $2N$ is the number of free variables
M	number of noisy samples
σ^2	Variance of the sampling noise
SNR	$N\mathsf{p}/\sigma^2$
$\dagger$	conjugate transpose
$\{t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_M\}$	sampling time instances
$H(\omega)$	pre-sampling filter
a_ℓ	$a_\ell = \lvert H(\ell\omega_0)\rvert^2 = H_R^2(\ell\omega_0) + H_I^2(\ell\omega_0)$, $a_\ell \leq 1$
$S(t)$, $\tilde{S}(t)$ and $\hat{S}(t)$	The original signal, the signal after passing the filter and its reconstruction, respectively.
Π	$(\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)^{-1}$ (defined in Section B.1)
Γ	$(\mathsf{p}L^\dagger Q^\dagger QL + \sigma^2 I)^{-1}$ (defined in Section B.1)

Table 1: Summary of notations.

the minima are achieved simultaneously at the same optimal sampling points and the same pre-sampling filter.

As discussed earlier, there are two stages in compression of a continuous signal: sampling phase and quantization phase. The overall reconstruction distortion depends on the choices that we make in both phases. We show that the optimal distortion can be written as the sum of two terms: one for sampling distortion and one for quantization distortion. Therefore, the problem essentially decomposes into two independent subproblems. Furthermore, we show that the asymptotic Shannon's rate distortion theory yields a lower bound on the compression distortion term.

Structure of the Paper: This paper is organized as follows: The preliminaries are given in Section 2. In Section 3, the problem is formally defined. In Section 4, the main results of the paper are presented; the proofs are relegated to Appendix B. In Section 5, numerical simulation results are provided. In Section 6, the future work is stated and finally the proofs and technical details are given in the Appendices.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, some theorems and lemmas that are used in the proofs of the main results are provided.

Lemma 1 *[24] (Peierl's Inequality)*
Let A be an $n\times n$ Hermitian matrix, and f be any convex function on $\mathbb{R}$. Let $\{u_1, u_2, \cdots, u_n\}$ be any orthonormal base of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then,

$$\mathtt{Tr}[f(A)] \geq \sum_{j=1}^{n} f(\langle u_j, Au_j\rangle), \tag{1}$$

where $\langle u_j, Au_j\rangle$ is the inner product between u_j and Au_j. Furthermore, for a strictly convex function f, equality holds if and only if each u_j is an eigenvector of A.

Theorem 1 *[21, p. 34] Every $n \times n$ circulant matrix $C = [c_{k-j}]$ has eigenvectors*

$$y^{(m)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n)}}[1, e^{-j2\pi m/n}, ..., e^{-j2\pi(n-1)m/n}],$$

for $m = 0, 1, \cdots, n-1$ and corresponding eigenvalues

$$\psi_m = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c_k e^{-j2\pi mk/n},$$

and can be expressed in the form $C = U\Psi U^*$, where U has the eigenvectors as columns in order and $\Psi = diag(\psi_m)$ is a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements $\psi_0, \psi_1, \cdots, \psi_n - 1$.



Figure 1: Sampling-Distortion Model. The signal $S(t)$ is passed through pre-sampling filter. The output $\tilde{S}(t)$ is sampled at times $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_M$. A noise Z is added to the signal at the time of sampling. The noisy observations are then used to recover the signal.

Theorem 2 *[21, p. 35] Let $B = [b_{k-j}]$ and $C = [c_{k-j}]$ be two $n \times n$ circulant matrices with eigenvalues*

$$\beta_m = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} b_k e^{-j2\pi mk/n}, \quad \psi_m = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c_k e^{-j2\pi mk/n},$$

respectively. Then matrices B and C commute and

$$BC = CB = U\Psi U^*,$$

where $\Psi = diag(\beta_m \psi_m)$, and BC is also a circulant matrix.

Theorem 3 *[22] Let A be an $m \times n$ matrix with singular values*

$$\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \cdots \geq \alpha_{\min(m,n)}.$$

Let B be a $p \times q$ submatrix of A (intersection of any p rows and any q columns of A) with singular values

$$\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 \geq \cdots \geq \beta_{\min(p,q)}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_i \geq \beta_i & \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, \min(p, q) \\ \beta_i \geq \alpha_{i+(m-p)+(n-q)} & \text{for} \quad i \leq \min(p+q-m, p+q-n) \end{cases}.$$

3 Problem Definition

We consider a continuous stationary bandlimited periodic signal defined as follows:

$$S(t) = \sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} [A_\ell \cos(\ell\omega_0 t) + B_\ell \sin(\ell\omega_0 t)], \tag{2}$$

where $\omega_0 = 2\pi/T$ is the fundamental frequency. The summation is from $\ell = N_1$ to N_2, indicating that the signal is bandlimited. We assume that A_ℓ and B_ℓ for $N_1 \leq \ell \leq N_2$ are mutually independent Gaussian rv's, distributed according to $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathsf{p})$ for some $\mathsf{p} > 0$. Thus, the signal power is $N\mathsf{p}/2$ where $N = N_2 - N_1 + 1$.

The discrete version of the signal is

$$S[n] = \sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} [A_\ell \cos(\ell\omega_0 n) + B_\ell \sin(\ell\omega_0 n)] \tag{3}$$

where $\omega_0 = 2\pi/T$ for some integer T.

Our model is depicted in Figure 1. The signal $S(t)$, given in (2), is passed through a pre-sampling filter, $H(\omega)$, to produce $\tilde{S}(t)$. The signal $\tilde{S}(t)$ is sampled at time instances $t = t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_M$, where $t_i \in [0, T)$. These samples are then corrupted by $Z(t)$, an i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussian noise denoted as $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. Thus, our observations are $Y_i = \tilde{S}(t_i) + Z_i, i = 1, 2, \cdots, M$. An estimator uses the noisy samples $(Y_1, Y_2, \cdots, Y_M)$ to reconstruct the original signal, denoted by $\hat{S}(t)$. The incurred sampling distortion given by MMSE criterion is equal to

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_{t=0}^{T} |\hat{S}(t) - S(t)|^2 dt.$$

This distortion is a random variable. Our goal is to compute the minimum of the expected value and minimum of the variance of this random variable, *i.e.,* to minimize

$$\mathsf{D} = \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1}{T}\int_{t=0}^{T}|\hat{S}(t)-S(t)|^2dt\right\}, \tag{4}$$

$$\mathsf{V} = \mathsf{Var}\left\{\frac{1}{T}\int_{t=0}^{T}|\hat{S}(t)-S(t)|^2dt\right\}. \tag{5}$$

We are free to choose $H(\omega)$ and sampling locations t_i's, $i \in \{1, 2, \cdots, M\}$. Therefore, the optimal average and variance of distortion are defined as follows:

$$\mathsf{D}_{\min} = \min_{H(\cdot),t_1,t_2,t_3,\cdots,t_M} \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1}{T}\int_{t=0}^{T}|\hat{S}(t)-S(t)|^2dt\right\}, \tag{6}$$

$$\mathsf{V}_{\min} = \min_{H(\cdot),t_1,t_2,t_3,\cdots,t_M} \mathsf{Var}\left\{\frac{1}{T}\int_{t=0}^{T}|\hat{S}(t)-S(t)|^2dt\right\}, \tag{7}$$

where the minimization is taken over the sampling locations and the pre-sampling filter.

We assume that $H(\omega)$ is a real LTI filter such that

$$a_\ell = |H(\ell\omega_0)|^2 \leq 1 \quad for\ all \quad N_1 \leq \ell \leq N_2, \tag{8}$$

meaning that the frequency gain of the signal is at most one; in other words, we assume that the filter is passive and hence cannot increase the signal energy in each frequency. In particular, all pass filters $|H(\omega)| = 1$ satisfy this assumption. The reason for introducing this assumption is that we can always normalize the power gain of the filter by scaling the sampling noise power. More specifically, replacing some given $H(\omega)$ with $\alpha H(\omega)$ for some α, changes $\tilde{S}(t_i)$ to $\alpha\tilde{S}(t_i)$. Hence, $Y_i = \tilde{S}(t_i) + Z_i$ would change to $Y_i = \alpha\tilde{S}(t_i) + Z_i$. But reconstruction from Y_i's yields the same distortion as the reconstruction from Y_i/α, which is equivalent to dividing the noise power by α.

4 Main Results

In this section, we first state two general lower bounds on the average and variance of distortion and then, using these lower bounds, we provide the main results of the paper. Note that $SNR = N\mathsf{p}/\sigma^2$ and $N = N_2 - N_1 + 1$ is proportional to the bandwidth of the signal. Remember that M is the number of noisy samples. The proofs of the main results are given Appendix B. We did not provide the formal proofs below the statement of the theorems because we first need to represent the problem in a matrix form, as given in Appendix B.1.

4.1 Two General Lower Bounds on the Average and Variance of Distortion

Lemma 2 *For any noise variance $\sigma > 0$ and any choice of the pre-sampling filter, the following lower bounds hold for all values of M:*

$$\frac{\mathsf{D}_{\min}}{\mathsf{p}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(2N - M + \frac{M}{1+SNR}\right),$$
$$\frac{\mathsf{V}_{\min}}{\mathsf{p}^2} \geq 2N - M + \frac{M}{(1+SNR)^2}.$$

*When we do not use a pre-sampling filter on the signal bandwidth (*i.e., *$H(\ell\omega_0) = 1$ for $\ell = N_1, \cdots, N_2$), equality in the above equations hold if and only if for any time instances t_i and t_j one of the following two equations hold:*

$$|t_i - t_j| = T\frac{m_1}{N}, \qquad \text{for some integer } m_1, \tag{9}$$

$$|t_i - t_j| = T\frac{2m_2+1}{2(N_1+N_2)}, \qquad \text{for some integer } m_2. \tag{10}$$

See Appendix B.2 for a proof.

In the next lemma, alternative lower bounds on $\mathsf{D}_{\min}$ and $\mathsf{V}_{\min}$ are given, which are tighter than the ones given in Lemma 2 for $M > 2N$.

Lemma 3 *For any $\sigma > 0$ and any choice of the pre-sampling filter, the following lower bounds hold for all values of M:*

$$\mathsf{D}_{\min} \geq \frac{N\mathsf{p}}{1+\frac{M}{2N}SNR}, \tag{11}$$

$$\mathsf{V}_{\min} \geq \frac{2N\mathsf{p}^2}{(1+\frac{M}{2N}SNR)^2}. \tag{12}$$

Furthermore, equality in the above equations hold if and only if $|H(\ell\omega_0)| = 1$ for $\ell = N_1, \cdots, N_2$ and the sampling time instances satisfy the following equation:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M} e^{j2\pi k\frac{t_i}{T}} = 0 \qquad \text{for} \quad k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, N-1\} \cup \{2N_1, 2N_1+1, \cdots, 2N_2\}. \tag{13}$$

See Appendix B.3 for a proof.

4.2 Sampling Distortion Tradeoffs for $M \leq N$

Here, the sampling-rate distortion tradeoffs are studied when the sampling rate is lower than the Landau rate. The optimal sampling strategy and thus the optimal distortion and variance are given in the following theorems.

Theorem 4 *For $M \leq N$, the optimal average and variance of distortion for any given pre-sampling filter are*

$$\frac{\mathsf{D}_{\min}}{\mathsf{p}} = \frac{1}{2}\left(2N - M + \frac{M}{1+SNR}\right), \tag{14}$$

$$\frac{\mathsf{V}_{\min}}{\mathsf{p}^2} = 2N - M + \frac{M}{(1+SNR)^2}. \tag{15}$$

Both the minimal average distortion and its variance are obtained with the pre-sampling filter $H(\ell\omega_0) = 1$ for $\ell = N_1, \cdots, N_2$ and choosing M distinct time instances arbitrarily from the following set of N samples [1]

$$\{0, \frac{1}{N}T, \frac{2}{N}T, \frac{3}{N}T, \cdots, \frac{N-1}{N}T\}.$$

The optimal interpolation formula for this set of sampling points is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{S}(t) &= \frac{\mathsf{p}}{N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2}\cos(\ell\omega_0(t-t_i))Y_i, \\ &= \frac{\mathsf{p}}{N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\cos(\frac{\omega_0}{2}(t-t_i))\cdot\frac{\sin(\frac{N\omega_0}{2}(t-t_i))}{\sin(\frac{\omega_0}{2}(t-t_i))}\cdot Y_i,\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where Y_i is the noisy sample of the signal at $t = t_i$.

See Appendix B.4 for a proof.

Remark 1 Consider (14). Observe that for fixed values of p and σ, the minimum distortion is linear in M. But it is not linear in N (as SNR in the denominator is $N\mathsf{p}/\sigma^2$), except when SNR goes to infinity. In the case of noiseless samples, $\sigma = 0$, the SNR will be infinity and the minimal distortion will be

$$\frac{\mathsf{p}}{2}(2N - M).$$

To intuitively understand this equation, observe that there are $2N$ free variables and we can recover M of them using the samples. Therefore, we will have $2N - M$ free variables, giving a total distortion of $(2N-M)\mathsf{p}/2$ as the power of each sinusoidal function is $\mathsf{p}/2$. Moreover, the maximum distortion is $2N(\mathsf{p}/2)$, which is obtained when $\sigma = \infty$ ($SNR = 0$) or $M = 0$. Finally, observe that when SNR is large,

$$\mathsf{D}_{\min} \approx \frac{\mathsf{p}}{2}\left(2N - M + \frac{M}{SNR}\right) = \frac{\mathsf{p}}{2}(2N-M) + \frac{M\sigma^2}{2N}$$

which is linear in both p and σ^2. Observe that $\mathsf{D}_{\min}$ is increasing in both p and σ^2, since $2N - M \geq 0$ for $M \leq N$. Furthermore, $(2N-M)/2 \geq M/(2N)$ when $M \leq N$, implying that the coefficient of p is greater than or equal to that of σ^2. Figure 2 depicts $\mathsf{D}_{\min}$ as a function of p, σ^2, M and N.



Figure 2: In the left subfigure, the minimum average distortion is illustrated as a function of M for different values of $M \leq N$. In the right subfigure, The minimum average distortion is depicted as a function of p for different values of the noise variance σ^2.

Proposition 1 *If we do not use a pre-sampling filter, the optimal sampling times $(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_M)$ given in the statement of Theorem 4 are essentially unique if N does not divide $2N_1 - 1$. More specifically, sampling times $(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_M)$ are optimal if there exists some constant $\tau < T/N$ such that for at least $M-1$ of the sampling points t_i we have*

$$t_i \in \{\tau, \tau + \frac{1}{N}T, \tau + \frac{2}{N}T, \tau + \frac{3}{N}T, \cdots, \tau + \frac{N-1}{N}T\}.$$

More generally, a set of sampling points $(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_M)$ are optimal if and only if t_i's are the solutions of the following equation for $1 \leq i, k \leq M$ and $i \neq k$

$$\sin\left(\pi N \frac{(t_i - t_k)}{T}\right) \cos\left(\pi(N_1 + N_2)\frac{(t_i - t_k)}{T}\right) = 0. \tag{17}$$

See Appendix B.5 for a proof.

4.2.1 Interference Management versus Interference Cancellation

When $M \leq N$, we have aliasing and cannot reconstruct the signal even when the sampling noise is zero. Assume that the number of samples, M, is even and consider a low-pass filter of bandwidth $M/2$ as follows:

$$H_1(\ell\omega_0) = \begin{cases} 1, & k \leq \ell < M/2 + k \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \tag{18}$$

for some $k \in [N_1 : N_2 - M/2 - 1]$. This filter makes all of the coefficients A_ℓ and B_ℓ equal to zero, except for M variables A_ℓ, B_ℓ when $k \leq \ell < M/2 + k$. Therefore, the number of remaining non-zero coefficients will be equal to the number of samples, M, and we will not have aliasing at the time of sampling. Therefore, there will be no interference from other signal coefficients. However, we incur a distortion when we filter out some of the coefficients A_ℓ and B_ℓ. This scheme resembles an interference cancellation strategy. On the other hand, if we use the following filter with bandwidth M,

$$|H_2(\ell\omega_0)|^2 = \begin{cases} 1 & ; \quad \ell = N_1, N_1 + 1, \cdots, N_1 + M - 1 \\ 0 & ; \quad \textit{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

we have kept more coefficients but with aliasing and interference from other coefficients. We compare the performance of these two filters under uniform sampling in the following theorem:

Theorem 5 *Suppose that we insist on using uniform sampling at rate M,* i.e., *taking the points*

$$\{t_1, t_2, t_3, \cdots, t_M\} = \{0, \frac{1}{M}T, \frac{2}{M}T, \frac{3}{M}T, \cdots, \frac{M-1}{M}T\}.$$

[1] Observe that these points are uniform sampling ones at <u>half</u> the Landau rate; they are not uniform sampling points corresponding to M samples, unless $M = N$. Uniform sampling for M points takes the samples at times $\{0, \frac{1}{M}T, \frac{2}{M}T, \frac{3}{M}T, \cdots, \frac{M-1}{M}T\}$.

Then, the performance of filter H_2 is equal to

$$\mathsf{D}_{H_2} = \frac{\mathsf{p}}{2}\left(2N - M + \frac{M}{1+\frac{M}{N}SNR}\right). \tag{19}$$

On the other hand, the performance of filter H_1 satisfies:

$$\mathsf{D}_{H_1} > \frac{\mathsf{p}}{2}\left(2N - M + \frac{M}{1+\frac{M}{2N}SNR}\right), \tag{20}$$

which is strictly greater than D_{H_1}, even when we increase the signal power by a factor of two.

See Appendix B.6 for a proof.

Discussion 1 Filter H_1 is like an *interference cancellation* scheme when we interpret aliasing as interference. But with filter H_2, we can do *interference management* and use the interfered aliased information to recover the signal. This yields an SNR gain of $2N/M$, comparing (19) and (20). To convey the essential intuition, consider the following different but simpler problem: suppose $\mathsf{A}, \mathsf{B} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathsf{p})$ are two independent Gaussian random variables. We are interested in recovering these two variables via one observation that is corrupted by a Gaussian noise of variance σ^2. The interference cancellation strategy corresponds to discarding B and observing $\mathsf{A} + Z$ where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ is the noise. This yields an estimation error of

$$\mathsf{p} + \frac{\mathsf{p}\sigma^2}{(\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)} = \mathsf{p}(1 + \frac{1}{1+SNR/2}), \tag{21}$$

where the p and $\mathsf{p}\sigma^2/(\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)$ are the estimation errors for B and A, respectively, and SNR is defined as $2\mathsf{p}/\sigma^2$. On the other hand, an interference management scheme observes $\mathsf{A}+\mathsf{B}+Z$. Here both A and B are interference terms for each other. The total estimation error in this case is equal to

$$2\frac{\mathsf{p}(\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)}{2\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2} = \mathsf{p}(1 + \frac{1}{1+SNR}). \tag{22}$$

In comparison to (21), the SNR gain of two is attained due to the interference management.

4.3 Sampling Distortion Tradeoffs for $N < M \leq 2N$

Here, the sampling-rate distortion tradeoffs for the rates between half the Landau rate and the Landau rate are stated.

Theorem 6 *For $N < M \leq 2N$ and any choice of the pre-sampling filter, the optimal average distortion can be bounded as follows*

$$\frac{\mathsf{D}_{\min}}{\mathsf{p}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(2N - M + \frac{M}{1+SNR}\right) \tag{23}$$

$$\frac{\mathsf{D}_{\min}}{\mathsf{p}} \leq \frac{1}{2}(2N-M) + \frac{2N-M}{2(1+SNR)} + \mathsf{Num}\cdot\frac{1+SNR}{1+2\ SNR} + (M-N-\mathsf{Num})\cdot\frac{1}{1+SNR}, \tag{24}$$

in which

$$\mathsf{Num} = \min\big(f(N_1, N), M-N\big)$$

and $f(a,b)$ is equal to

$$f(a,b) = \begin{cases} b-1 & \text{if } r = 0 \\ 2b-2r+1 & \text{if } 2r > b \\ 2r-1 & \text{if } 0 < 2r \leq b \end{cases}$$

where r is the remainder of dividing a by b. The lower bound given in (23) is tight when $N|2N_1 - 1$ for any arbitrary $M \leq 2N$. To achieve the optimal distortion, no pre-sampling filter is necessary; a set of optimal time instances is

$$\{t_1, t_2, t_3, \cdots, t_M\} \subset \Big\{0, \frac{1}{N}T, \frac{2}{N}T, \cdots, \frac{N-1}{N}T, \\ \frac{T}{2(N_1+N_2)}, \frac{1}{N}T + \frac{T}{2(N_1+N_2)}, \frac{2}{N}T + \frac{T}{2(N_1+N_2)}, \cdots, \frac{N-1}{N}T + \frac{T}{2(N_1+N_2)}\Big\}.$$

Moreover, the upper bound on the average distortion given in (24) is obtained when we do not use a filter on the signal bandwidth, and choose the M sample points as follows:

$$\{0, \frac{1}{N}T, \frac{2}{N}T, \frac{3}{N}T, \cdots, \frac{N-1}{N}T, \quad \frac{1}{2N}T, \frac{3}{2N}T, \cdots, \frac{2M-2N-1}{2N}T\}. \tag{25}$$

See Appendix B.7 for a proof.

Remark 2 If we do not use a pre-sampling filter on the signal bandwidth, the necessary and sufficient conditions for optimality of the lower bound on average distortion is the one given in (17). The proof is similar to that given in Proposition (1).

4.4 Sampling Distortion Tradeoffs for $M \geq 2N$

In this subsection, we develop the sampling-rate distortion tradeoffs for the rates above the Landau rate. We have the following theorems:

Theorem 7 *For $M \geq 2N$ and any choice of the pre-sampling filter, the following lower bounds on optimal average and variance of distortion hold:*

$$\frac{\mathsf{D}_{\min}}{\mathsf{p}} \geq \frac{N}{1+\frac{M}{2N}.SNR}, \tag{26}$$

$$\frac{\mathsf{V}_{\min}}{\mathsf{p}^2} \geq \frac{2N}{(1+\frac{M}{2N}SNR)^2}. \tag{27}$$

Moreover, these lower bounds are tight if and only if $|H(\ell\omega_0)| = 1$ for $\ell = N_1, \cdots, N_2$ and time instances t_i's satisfy the following equation:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M} e^{j2\pi k\frac{t_i}{T}} = 0 \qquad \text{for} \quad k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, N-1\} \cup \{2N_1, 2N_1+1, \cdots, 2N_2\}. \tag{28}$$

Uniform sampling, i.e., *$t_i = iT/M, i = 1, 2, \cdots, M$ is a solution to the above equation if for each k in the interval $2N_1 \leq k \leq 2N_2$, we have $M \nmid k$. In particular, uniform sampling is optimal when $M > 2N_2$. Also the reconstruction formula for the optimal set of sampling points is given by*

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{S}(t) &= \frac{\mathsf{p}}{\frac{M}{2}\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2}\cos(\ell\omega_0(t-t_i))Y_i,\\ &= \frac{\mathsf{p}}{N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\cos(\frac{\omega_0}{2}(t-t_i))\cdot\frac{\sin(\frac{N\omega_0}{2}(t-t_i))}{\sin(\frac{\omega_0}{2}(t-t_i))}\cdot Y_i,\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where Y_i is the noisy sample of the signal at $t = t_i$.

See Appendix B.8 for a proof.

Remark 3 When M goes to infinity, the minimum distortion $\mathsf{D}_{\min} = O(1/M)$ goes to zero, regardless of the value of sampling noise. To see this, observe that when M is very large ($M > 2N_2$), the lower bounds given in (26) and (27) are tight.

Remark 4 Unlike the case of $M \leq N$ where the optimal sampling points could be found without any need to know N_1, observe that the constraint given in (28) depends on N_1. Furthermore, the uniform sampling strategy, $t_i = iT/M$, is not in general a solution to the above equation. For instance, uniform sampling is not an optimal strategy if $M \mid k$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, N-1\} \cup \{2N_1, 2N_1+1, \cdots, 2N_2\}$, since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M} e^{j2\pi k\frac{t_i}{T}} = \sum_{i=1}^{M} e^{j2\pi k\frac{i}{M}} = M \neq 0.$$

Below are some examples of non-uniform solutions of (28):

Example 1 When $M = 2$, $N = 1$ and $N_1 = 1$, sampling points $t_1 = 0, t_2 = T/4$ are optimal.

Example 2 Given any N_1 and N_2, let $\mathcal{K} = \{1, 2, \cdots, N-1\} \cup \{2N_1, 2N_1+1, \cdots, 2N_2\}$. Let us show $\mathcal{K}$ by $\mathcal{K} = \{k_1, \cdots, k_{|\mathcal{K}|}\}$. Then the following $M = 2^{|\mathcal{K}|}$ non-uniform sampling points are optimal for $i \in [0 : M-1]$: let

$$t_i = \sum_{r=1}^{|\mathcal{K}|} b_r \frac{T}{2k_r},$$



Figure 3: Sampling-Compression-Distortion Model.

where $(b_1, \cdots, b_{|\mathcal{K}|}) \in \{0,1\}^{|\mathcal{K}|}$ is the binary expansion of time index $i \in [0 : M-1]$. We verify that (28) holds:

$$\sum_i e^{j2\pi k \frac{t_i}{T}} = \sum_{b_1,\cdots,b_{|\mathcal{K}|}} e^{j2\pi k \sum_{r=1}^{|\mathcal{K}|} b_r \frac{1}{2k_r}} \tag{30}$$

$$= \prod_{r=1}^{|\mathcal{K}|} \left(\sum_{b_r} e^{j\pi b_r \frac{k}{k_r}} \right) \tag{31}$$

$$= \prod_{r=1}^{|\mathcal{K}|} \left(1 + e^{j\pi \frac{k}{k_r}} \right), \tag{32}$$

which is zero if $k \in \mathcal{K}$, *i.e.*, $k = k_r$ for some r.

4.5 Sampling/Compression Distortion Tradeoffs

So far we have focused on sampling distortion. We now consider a more general model depicted in Fig. 3, consisting of a pre-sampling filter, a sampling strategy, a compressor and a decompressor. The compressor (or the encoder) takes in the M samples of the signal and maps it to n_c bits, via a function $\mathcal{E} : \mathbb{R}^M \mapsto \{0,1\}^{n_c}$. The decoder $\mathcal{D}$ uses the n_c bits to recover the signal $\hat{S}_D(t)$. This is done via a decoding function

$$\mathcal{D} : \{0,1\}^{n_c} \mapsto \mathcal{S}$$

where $\mathcal{S}$ is the space of all periodic signals with bandwidth $[N_1\omega_0, N_2\omega_0]$.

Here the compression rate $R_c = n_c/T$ bits per second, and the sampling rate is M samples per T seconds, i.e. $R_s = M/T$ samples per second.

The goal is to minimize the average distortion between the original signal $S(t)$ and the decoder's reconstruction $\hat{S}_{\mathcal{D}}(t) = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E}(Y_{1:M}))$, where $Y_{1:M}$ are the M noisy samples of $S(t)$. In other words, we would like to minimize

$$\frac{1}{T}\int_{t=0}^{T} \mathbb{E}\{|\hat{S}_{\mathcal{D}}(t) - S(t)|^2\}dt.$$

The minimization is taken over the sampling points, the pre-sampling filter, and the choice of the encoder $\mathcal{E}$ and the decoder $\mathcal{D}$. To minimize the total distortion over these four parameters, we fix the first two parameters (the sampling points and the pre-sampling filter) and minimize distortion over the encoder and decoder functions. Then, one should take the minimum over the first two parameters. The following theorem addresses the first minimization over the encoding and decoding functions, when the sampling instances and the pre-sampling filter are fixed.

Theorem 8 *For a fixed pre-sampling filter and sampling instances t_i's, the optimal encoder works as follows: it first computes its best estimate of the original signal, $\hat{S}_{\mathcal{E}}(t)$, from the noisy samples. In other words, it first finds a signal $\hat{S}_{\mathcal{E}}(t)$ as a function of samples $Y_{1:M}$ that minimizes*

$$\mathsf{D}_s = \frac{1}{T}\int_{t=0}^{T} \mathbb{E}\{|\hat{S}_{\mathcal{E}}(t) - S(t)|^2\}dt.$$

Then, it tries to convey $\hat{S}_{\mathcal{E}}(t)$ to the decoder, by compressing it to n_c bits. The optimal decoder works as follows: it takes the n_c bits and computes $\hat{S}_{\mathcal{D}}(t)$ such that its average distortion with $\hat{S}_{\mathcal{E}}(t)$ is minimized, i.e.,

$$\mathsf{D}_c = \frac{1}{T}\int_{t=0}^{T} \mathbb{E}\{|\hat{S}_{\mathcal{D}}(t) - \hat{S}_{\mathcal{E}}(t)|^2\}dt$$

is minimized at the decoder. This choice of encoder and decoder is optimal as it will also minimize the end-to-end distortion

$$\frac{1}{T}\int_{t=0}^{T} \mathbb{E}\{|\hat{S}_{\mathcal{D}}(t) - S(t)|^2\}dt.$$

Moreover, the optimal total distortion is equal to the sum of sampling distortion and compression distortions, i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{T}\int_{t=0}^{T}\mathbb{E}\{|\hat{S}_{\mathcal{D}}(t)-S(t)|^2\}dt=\mathsf{D}_s+\mathsf{D}_c.$$

See Appendix B.9 for a proof.

Remark 5 The tradeoff between sampling distortion and quantization distortion is evident from the above theorem. For instance, if we do not sample at all, the optimal reconstruction $\hat{S}_{\mathcal{E}}(t)$ will be the all zero signal. In this case, we will have a high sampling distortion but the compression distortion D_c will be zero. On the other hand, if we use the optimal sampling strategy for the signal, by assuming a constant total distortion, if the sampling distortion decreases, we can endure more compression distortion. Unfortunately, we lack an exact closed form expression for rate distortion of a given source when we have a single copy of the source (not many i.i.d. copies). Therefore, solving the joint optimization seems difficult.

Proposition 2 *For a given pre-sampling filter and sampling instances t_i's, the value of D_s in the statement of Theorem 8 is given by $\mathsf{D}_s=\mathtt{Tr}(C_e)/2$ which is given in* (49)*. Furthermore, by employing a known result in rate-distortion theory, given n_c bits for compression, we must have*

$$n_c\geq\sum_{i=1}^{M}\frac{1}{2}\log\frac{\lambda_i}{\min(\lambda_i,\mu)},$$

where λ_i's are the eigenvalues of $\mathsf{p}I-C_e$, and μ is some constant such that $\sum_i\min(\lambda_i,\mu)=\mathsf{D}_c$.

See Appendix B.11 for a proof.

4.6 Extension to Sparse Signals

It would be interesting to extend our results to the case when the coefficients A_ℓ and B_ℓ in (2) are mutually independent zero-mean Gaussian rv's with arbitrary variances α_ℓ and β_ℓ respectively for $N_1<\ell<N_2$. The signal $S(t)$ will be stationary if and only if $\alpha_\ell=\beta_\ell=\mathsf{p}_\ell$ for some p_ℓ. To see this, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{Var}[S(t)]&=\mathbb{E}\{S(t)^2\}-\mathbb{E}^2\{S(t)\}\\&=\mathbb{E}\{\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2}[A_\ell\cos(\ell\omega_0t)+B_\ell\sin(\ell\omega_0t)]\}^2\\&=\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2}\left(\alpha_\ell\cos^2(\ell\omega_0t)+\beta_\ell\sin^2(\ell\omega_0t)\right)\\&=\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2}\left(\frac{\alpha_\ell+\beta_\ell}{2}+\frac{\alpha_\ell-\beta_\ell}{2}\cos(2\ell\omega_0t)\right)\end{aligned}$$

which is independent of t if and only if $\alpha_\ell=\beta_\ell=\mathsf{p}_\ell$ for some p_ℓ.

Observe that the signal is *sparse* if p_ℓ is non-negligible for few values of ℓ.

For the case of equal variances $\mathsf{p}_\ell=\mathsf{p}$ for $\ell=N_1,\cdots,N_2$, we stated two general lower bounds on the average distortion (See Subsection 4.1). When p_ℓ values are distinct, we can generalize the second lower bound given in Lemma 3 as follows (we assume that the frequency support is known):

Proposition 3 *For any $\sigma>0$ and any choice of the pre-sampling filter, the following lower bound on the average distortion holds for all values of M:*

$$\mathsf{D}_{\min}\geq\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2}\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\mathsf{p}_\ell}+\frac{M}{2\sigma^2}}.\tag{33}$$

Furthermore, equality in the above equation holds if and only if $|H(\ell\omega_0)|=1$ for $\ell=N_1,\cdots,N_2$ and the sampling time instances satisfy the following equation:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M}e^{j2\pi k\frac{t_i}{T}}=0\qquad\text{for}\quad k\in\{1,2,\cdots,N-1\}\cup\{2N_1,2N_1+1,\cdots,2N_2\}.\tag{34}$$

Uniform sampling, i.e., *$t_i=iT/M, i=1,2,\cdots,M$ is a solution to the above equation if for each k in the interval $2N_1\leq k\leq 2N_2$, $M\nmid k$. In particular, for the rates above the Nyquist rate,* i.e., *$M>2N_2$, uniform sampling is optimal.*

See Appendix B.11 for a proof.

4.7 Extension to Discrete Signals

Consider a real periodic discrete signal of the form

$$S[n] = \sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} [A_\ell \cos(\ell\omega_0 n) + B_\ell \sin(\ell\omega_0 n)], \tag{35}$$

where $\omega_0 = \frac{2\pi}{T}$ for some integer T, and $1 \leq N_1 \leq N_2 < T/2$ are natural numbers. Observe that T is the period of the discrete signal and $A_\ell - jB_\ell$ is the ℓ-th DFT coefficients of the discrete signal $S[n]$.

Suppose that we have M noisy samples at time instances $\{t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_M\}$. We would like to use these samples to reconstruct the discrete signal $S[n]$. If the reconstruction is $\hat{S}[n] = \sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} [\hat{A}_\ell \cos(\ell\omega_0 n) + \hat{B}_\ell \sin(\ell\omega_0 n)]$, the distortion $\sum_{n=1}^{T} |S[n] - \hat{S}[n]|^2$ is proportional to $\sum_\ell |A_\ell - \hat{A}_\ell|^2 + |B_\ell - \hat{B}_\ell|^2$. Thus, the formulation for minimizing the distortion is the same as that of the continuous signals which is given in B.1. The only exception is that we additionally have the restriction that t_i's should be integers. Below, is an observation about the discrete time formulation:

Whenever the optimal sampling points in the continuous formulation turns out to be integer values, they are the optimal points in the discrete case. And when the optimal sampling points are not integers, simulation results with exhaustive search show that their closest integer values are either optimal or nearly optimal. For example, when the signal period is $T = 15$ and $(M, N_1, N) = (3, 1, 4)$. In this case $M \leq N$ and the optimal sampling points in the continuous case are

$$\{t_1, t_2, t_3\} \subset \{0 + \tau, 3.75 + \tau, 7.5 + \tau, 11.25 + \tau\},$$

for some $\tau \in [0, T]$. The rounds of these point for $\tau = 1.1$ are optimal in the discrete case, *i.e.,* any choice of time instances from the set $\{1, 5, 8, 12\}$ is optimal. On the other hand, when the signal period is $T = 15$ and $(M, N_1, N) = (4, 1, 6)$. Here again $M \leq N$ and

$$\{t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4\} \subset \digamma = \{0 + \tau, 2.5 + \tau, 5 + \tau, 7.5 + \tau, 10 + \tau, 12.5 + \tau\}$$

are the only continuous optimal points. Rounding these points to their closest integers yields $\mathsf{D} = 8.0069$. However, the optimal points are $\{1, 2, 8, 9\}$ resulting in $\mathsf{D}_{min} = 8.0068$. Note that the distance between the first two optimal points is 1, which cannot be achieved by choosing any arbitrary value of τ, since the distance between any of the points in $\digamma$ is 2.5.

5 Simulation Results

In this section, we evaluate the optimal reconstruction interpolation formulas derived in the previous sections and also simulate an iterative method for the reconstruction of optimal non-uniform positions. We will see that the simulation results match the stated results.

Fig. 4 illustrates the MMSE reconstruction from optimal sampling points given in (16) for high SNR scenario. The figure also depicts the reconstruction result using an iterative method [20]. Its performance is near optimal in the high SNR scenario. Fig. 5 uses the same parameters for generating the signal, but the variance of the noise is higher (low SNR scenario).

Figs. 6 and 7 represent the average distortion, D, and the variance of distortion, V, for different values of M, N_1 and N. These figures show that whenever the average distortion is minimum, the variance of distortion is also minimum. This confirms the results given in Theorems 4 and 7. Even though we cannot prove the same result for all values of $M > N$, simulation results for $M \leq 4$ indicate that the two terms are minimized at the same sampling locations.

In Fig. 8, the two lower bounds on average distortion derived in Lemmas 2 and 3 are plotted. The first lower bound is tight for $M \leq N$, as shown in Theorem 4. The second lower bound is tight for sufficiently large $M > 2N$, as discussed in Theorem 7. The maximum of these lower bounds is depicted in Fig. 9. In this figure, the distortion of uniform sampling without any pre-sampling filter on the signal bandwidth is also depicted. We make the following observations in this figure: the performance of the uniform sampling is close to optimal for $M \leq N$ (its curve almost matches that of the lower bound in Lemma 2 which is optimal for $M \leq N$). While we expect that increasing the number of uniform samples should lead to a better performance, we see that near the Landau rate, increasing the sampling points does not decrease the uniform sampling distortion. Here, the curve for uniform sampling reaches its maximum at $M = 21$, whereas the Landau rate is 16. The curve decreases from $M = 21$ onwards and matches the second lower bound at $M = 29$. Thus, uniform sampling is optimal for $M \geq 29$. Finally, the explicit upper bound on the performance of the sampling points given in (25) in Theorem 6 is also depicted in this figure. It matches that of uniform sampling at $M = N$ and $M = 2N$, as

expected. Fig. 10 is similar to Fig. 9, but for different values of N_1 and N. It shows that the explicit upper bound of Theorem 6 can be below the distortion of uniform sampling.

While the above figures have been plotted for $\mathsf{p} = \sigma = 1$, our simulation results show that decreasing the variance of noise will reduce the gap between the lower and the upper bounds.

Finally, Fig. 11 compares uniform sampling (without a pre-sampling filter) with the optimal non-uniform sampling strategy for $M \leq N$. The performances of these two strategies are close to each other. More specifically, the figure depicts the difference of the distortion of the two strategies, divided by the distortion of optimal sampling. It shows that we can get a gain of at most 0.3 percentage of the distortion obtained by using the optimal non-uniform sampling strategy. However, a main advantage of the optimal nonuniform sampling is its *robustness* with respect to missing samples (as discussed in the introduction).

6 Future Work

We studied the effect of sampling strategy and a pre-sampling filter on the reconstruction distortion of a periodic bandlimited signal of the form given in (2). Deriving the optimal points for the discrete case in general is also of importance. Moreover, it would be interesting to find the optimal quantizer. Other extensions include considering a more general class of signals. Furthermore, we consider only the sampling noise in this work; one can consider adding noise to the signal itself, before sampling.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Amin Gohari, Salman Beigi and Arash Amini for helpful discussions. In particular, the proof of Theorem 9 is due to Amin Gohari.

Appendix

A Optimal Estimator for Minimizing Variance of Distortion

The conventional MMSE estimation problem for estimating a vector $\mathbf{X}$ from vector $\mathbf{Y}$ asks for minimizing the expected value of

$$D = \|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|^2,$$

where the estimator $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ is created as a function of observation $\mathbf{Y}$. However, this would only ensure that the distortion is minimized on *average*. In practice, we get one copy of $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{Y}$, and we want to ensure that the distortion that we obtain is small for that one copy, not just on average. Minimizing the variance of D makes sense for the following two reasons:

- If random variables D and D' are independent and have the same distribution, then

$$\mathsf{Var}(D) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\big[(D - D')^2\big].$$

  In other words, if we take two independent instances of the problem $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ and $(\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{Y}')$. Then the average gap between the distortion of these two problems, *i.e.,* D and D', has average $\mathsf{Var}(D)$;

- By Chebyshev's inequality, the probability of D exceeding a threshold depends not only on the average of D, but also on its variance.

In this Appendix we show that for jointly Gaussian random variables, the estimator that minimizes the expected value of D, also minimizes its variance.

Theorem 9 *Suppose* $\mathbf{X}$ *and* $\mathbf{Y}$ *are two correlated jointly Gaussian vectors, having covariance matrices* $C_{\boldsymbol{X}}$*,* $C_{\boldsymbol{Y}}$ *and* $C_{\boldsymbol{XY}}$*. Let* $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ *be a function of* $\mathbf{Y}$*, and consider the cost*

$$\mathsf{Var}(\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|^2).$$

The estimator $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ *that minimizes the above cost constraint is* $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}]$*, and the minimum variance is equal to* $2\mathtt{Tr}(C_e^2)$ *where*

$$C_e = C_{\boldsymbol{X}} - C_{\boldsymbol{XY}} C_{\boldsymbol{Y}}^{-1} C_{\boldsymbol{YX}}.$$



(a)



(b)

Figure 4: Two random signals generated using parameters $(N, N_1, \mathsf{p}, \sigma) = (7, 4, 1, 0.1)$ are depicted. Their reconstruction with $M = 13$ samples are also depicted, employing the optimal MMSE method and the iterative method of [20]. The sampling points are optimally chosen. The average reconstruction distortion (MMSE) over *all* random signals with the given parameters is $\mathsf{D} = 0.5093$. Subfigure (a): the distortion of the optimal MMSE method is $\mathsf{D} = 0.0200$ and the distortion of the iterative method is $\mathsf{D}_{\text{iterative}} = 0.0379$. Subfigure (b): the distortion of the optimal MMSE method is $\mathsf{D} = 1.6038$ and the distortion of the iterative method is $\mathsf{D}_{\text{iterative}} = 1.6042$.



(a)



(b)

Figure 5: Two random signals generated using parameters $(N, N_1, \mathsf{p}, \sigma) = (7, 4, 1, 2)$ are depicted. Their reconstruction with $M = 13$ samples are also depicted, employing the optimal MMSE method and the iterative method of [20]. The sampling points are optimally chosen. The average reconstruction distortion (MMSE) over *all* random signals with the given parameters is $\mathsf{D} = 1.9444$. Subfigure (a): distortion of the optimal MMSE method is $\mathsf{D} = 0.2414$ and the distortion of the iterative method is $\mathsf{D}_{\text{iterative}} = 0.3079$. Subfigure (b): distortions of the optimal MMSE method is $\mathsf{D} = 1.8347$ and the distortion of the iterative method is $\mathsf{D}_{\text{iterative}} = 1.9700$.



(a) $(M, N_1, N) = (2, 3, 2)$



(b) $(M, N_1, N) = (2, 2, 4)$

Figure 6: The average and variance of distortion are depicted for different values of N_1 and N. The signal period is $T = 1$. Here $M = 2$ and $t_1 = 0$. The only degree of freedom is therefore t_2, which is shown on the x-axis.



Figure 7: The average and variance of distortion for $(M, N_1, N) = (2, 2, 1)$. The signal period is $T = 1$. Here $M = 2$ and $t_1 = 0$. The only degree of freedom is therefore t_2, which is shown on the x-axis.



Figure 8: The lower bounds on the average distortion given in Lemmas 2 and 3.



Figure 9: The average distortion for $(N_1, N, \mathsf{p}, \sigma) = (7, 8, 1, 1)$. The signal period is $T = 1$. Here M is shown on the x-axis and goes from one to $4N$. The union lower bound and the upper bound given in Theorem 6 for M between N and $2N$ are depicted. The performance of uniform sampling without using a pre-sampling filter is also plotted.



Figure 10: The average distortion for $(N_1, N, \mathsf{p}, \sigma) = (9, 9, 1, 1)$. The description of this figure is similar to that of Fig. 9.



Figure 11: The difference of the distortions of the uniform and optimal sampling, divided by the distortion of the optimal sampling. The parameters for this figure are $(N_1, N, \mathsf{p}, \sigma) = (4, 7, 1, 1)$.

Proof: We have

$$\mathsf{Var}(\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|^2) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}}\mathsf{Var}(\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|^2|\mathbf{Y}) + \mathsf{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}}[\mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|^2|\mathbf{Y})]. \tag{36}$$

We claim that both of the terms $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}}\mathsf{Var}(\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|^2|\mathbf{Y})$ and $\mathsf{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}}[\mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|^2|\mathbf{Y})]$ are minimized when $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}]$. The second term is always non-negative and becomes zero when $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}]$. This is because $\mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|^2|\mathbf{Y})$ will be equal to $\mathsf{Var}(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y})$ which is a constant and does not depend on the value of $\mathbf{Y}$ for jointly Gaussian random variables. Therefore, its variance is zero if $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}]$.

To prove that the second term is minimized at $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}]$, it suffices to show that this claim for all values of $\mathbf{y}$. We will be done if we have the following statement: for any jointly Gaussian vector $\mathbf{X}$, the function

$$f(\mathbf{c}) = \mathsf{Var}(\|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{c}\|^2)$$

is minimized at $\mathbf{c} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}]$. Let $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, C_{\mathbf{X}})$. Then observe that $\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{c} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu - \mathbf{c}, C_{\mathbf{X}})$. If we replace $\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{c}$ by $U(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{c})$ for some unitary matrix U, the norm $\|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{c}\|^2$ remains invariant. Therefore, without loss of generality we can assume that $C_{\mathbf{X}}$ is diagonal. Then $\|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{c}\|^2 = \sum_i^n (X_i - c_i)^2$ is the sum of independent Gaussian random variables. Let σ_i^2 be the variance of X_i. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{c}) &= \sum_i \mathsf{Var}((X_i - c_i)^2) && (37)\\ &= \sum_i \mathbb{E}((X_i - c_i)^4) - \mathbb{E}((X_i - c_i)^2)^2 && (38)\\ &= \sum_i (\mu_i - c_i)^4 + 6(\mu_i - c_i)^2\sigma_i^2 + 3\sigma_i^4 - (\sigma_i^2 + (\mu_i - c_i)^2)^2 && (39)\\ &= \sum_i 4(\mu_i - c_i)^2\sigma_i^2 + 2\sigma_i^4, && (40) \end{aligned}$$

which is clearly minimized when $c_i = \mu_i$, and the minimum will be equal to $2\sum_i \sigma_i^4 = 2\mathtt{Tr}(C_{\mathbf{X}}^2)$.

Coming back to the original minimization problem, we see that the covariance matrix of $\mathbf{X}$ given any value for $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}$, does not depend on the value of $\mathbf{y}$, and is equal to C_e, where

$$C_e = C_{\mathbf{X}} - C_{\mathbf{XY}}C_{\mathbf{Y}}^{-1}C_{\mathbf{YX}}.$$

Therefore, the overall minimum variance is equal to

$$2\mathtt{Tr}(C_e^2).$$

□

B Proofs

Here, we first provide a matrix representation of the problem.

B.1 Problem Representation in a Matrix Form

Let $\mathbf{X}$ be the vector of coefficients A_ℓ and B_ℓ ($\ell = N_1, N_1+1, \cdots, N_2$) of the original signal, $S(t)$, given in (2), *i.e.,*

$$\mathbf{X} = [A_{N_1}, \cdots, A_{N_2}, B_{N_1}, \cdots, B_{N_2}]^\dagger. \tag{41}$$

Since the vector $\mathbf{X}$ consists of real numbers, $\dagger$ is just the transpose operation in the above equation. After filtering $S(t)$, we get

$$\tilde{S}(t) = \sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} [\tilde{A}_\ell \cos(\ell\omega_0 t) + \tilde{B}_\ell \sin(\ell\omega_0 t)] \tag{42}$$

in which

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{A}_\ell = A_\ell H_R(\ell\omega_0) + B_\ell H_I(\ell\omega_0), \\ \tilde{B}_\ell = B_\ell H_R(\ell\omega_0) - A_\ell H_I(\ell\omega_0), \end{cases} \tag{43}$$

for $\ell = N_1, N_1+1, \cdots, N_2$, where $H_R(\omega)$ and $H_I(\omega)$ are the real and imaginary parts of $H(\omega)$, respectively. If we denote the vector of coefficients of $\tilde{S}(t)$ as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = [\tilde{A}_{N_1}, \cdots, \tilde{A}_{N_2}, \tilde{B}_{N_1}, \cdots, \tilde{B}_{N_2}]^\dagger$$

and express (43) in matrix form, we get

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = L\mathbf{X},$$

where

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} L_1 & L_2 \\ -L_2 & L_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$L_1 = \begin{pmatrix} H_R(N_1\omega_0) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & H_R((N_1+1)\omega_0) & 0 & 0 \\ & & \vdots & \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & H_R(N_2\omega_0) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$L_2 = \begin{pmatrix} H_I(N_1\omega_0) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & H_I((N_1+1)\omega_0) & 0 & 0 \\ & & \vdots & \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & H_I(N_2\omega_0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The signal $\tilde{S}(t)$ is then sampled at time instances t_i for $i = 1, 2 \cdots, M$. We have

$$\tilde{S}(t_i) = \sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} [\tilde{A}_\ell \cos(\ell\omega_0 t_i) + \tilde{B}_\ell \sin(\ell\omega_0 t_i)].$$

Let $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}$ be the vector of the samples

$$\tilde{\mathbf{S}} = [\tilde{S}(t_1), \tilde{S}(t_2), \cdots, \tilde{S}(t_M)]^\dagger.$$

Therefore, in matrix form, we have $\tilde{\mathbf{S}} = Q\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = QL\mathbf{X}$ where Q is an $M \times 2N$ matrix of the form

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(N_1\omega_0 t_1) & \cos((N_1+1)\omega_0 t_1) & \cdots & \cos(N_2\omega_0 t_1) & \sin(N_1\omega_0 t_1) & \sin((N_1+1)\omega_0 t_1) & \cdots & \sin(N_2\omega_0 t_1) \\ \cos(N_1\omega_0 t_2) & \cos((N_1+1)\omega_0 t_2) & \cdots & \cos(N_2\omega_0 t_2) & \sin(N_1\omega_0 t_2) & \sin((N_1+1)\omega_0 t_2) & \cdots & \sin(N_2\omega_0 t_2) \\ & & & \vdots & \vdots & & & \\ \cos(N_1\omega_0 t_M) & \cos((N_1+1)\omega_0 t_M) & \cdots & \cos(N_2\omega_0 t_M) & \sin(N_1\omega_0 t_M) & \sin((N_1+1)\omega_0 t_M) & \cdots & \sin(N_2\omega_0 t_M) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Finally, the vector of observations denoted by $\mathbf{Y}$ can be writen as

$$\mathbf{Y} = \tilde{\mathbf{S}} + \mathbf{Z} = QL\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{Z},$$

where $\mathbf{Z}$ is the noise vector.

Estimation of $S(t)$ is equivalent to the estimation of its Fourier coefficients. If we denote the coefficients of the reconstruction signal by

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}} = [\hat{A}_{N_1}, \cdots, \hat{A}_{N_2}, \hat{B}_{N_1}, \cdots, \hat{B}_{N_2}]^\dagger,$$

using the Parseval's theorem, we will have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T}\int_{t=0}^{T} |\hat{S}(t) - S(t)|^2 dt &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} \left(|\hat{B}_\ell - B_\ell|^2 + |\hat{A}_\ell - A_\ell|^2\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Computing average distortion:

Our goal is to use $\mathbf{Y}$ to estimate the signal with minimal distortion, *i.e.,* from (44), we would like to minimize

$$\mathsf{D} = \frac{1}{T}\int_{t=0}^{T} \mathbb{E}\{|\hat{S}(t) - S(t)|^2\} dt = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|^2. \tag{45}$$

Since all the random variables are Gaussian, the linear MMSE is optimal and thus we would like to use $QL\mathbf{X}+\mathbf{Z}$ to find $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ such that $E\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|^2$ is minimized. The MMSE estimator and the mean square error are given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{MMSE}}(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{y}\} = W\mathbf{y}, \tag{46}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}^2\| = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}}\{\mathsf{Var}[\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}]\} = \mathtt{Tr}(C_e), \tag{47}$$

where the matrix W and the error covariance C_e are of the forms:

$$\begin{aligned} W &= C_{\mathbf{X}} L^\dagger Q^\dagger (QLC_{\mathbf{X}} L^\dagger Q^\dagger + C_{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1} \\ &= \mathsf{p} L^\dagger Q^\dagger (\mathsf{p} QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)^{-1} \\ &= \mathsf{p} L^\dagger Q^\dagger \Pi, \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_e &= C_{\mathbf{X}} - C_{\mathbf{X}} L^\dagger Q^\dagger (QLC_{\mathbf{X}} L^\dagger Q^\dagger + C_{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1} QLC_{\mathbf{X}} \\ &= \mathsf{p} I - \mathsf{p}^2 L^\dagger Q^\dagger (\mathsf{p} QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)^{-1} QL \\ &= \mathsf{p} I - \mathsf{p}^2 L^\dagger Q^\dagger \Pi QL. \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

In the above formulas, we have used the fact that $C_{\mathbf{X}} = \mathsf{p} I_{2N\times 2N}$ and $C_{\mathbf{Z}} = \sigma^2 I_{M\times M}$. Also we have defined

$$\Pi_{M\times M} \triangleq (\mathsf{p} QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)^{-1}. \tag{50}$$

Using the alternative form for the Linear MMSE estimator derived in [23, p. 90], we have

$$\begin{aligned} W &= (L^\dagger Q^\dagger C_{\mathbf{Z}}^{-1} QL + C_{\mathbf{X}}^{-1})^{-1} L^\dagger Q^\dagger C_{\mathbf{Z}}^{-1} \\ &= \mathsf{p}(\mathsf{p} L^\dagger Q^\dagger QL + \sigma^2 I)^{-1} L^\dagger Q^\dagger \\ &= \mathsf{p}\Gamma L^\dagger Q^\dagger, \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

$$C_e = (L^\dagger Q^\dagger C_{\mathbf{Z}}^{-1} QL + C_{\mathbf{X}}^{-1})^{-1} \tag{52}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathsf{p}\sigma^2 (\mathsf{p} L^\dagger Q^\dagger QL + \sigma^2 I)^{-1} \\ &= \mathsf{p}\sigma^2 \Gamma, \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

where

$$\Gamma_{2N\times 2N} \triangleq (\mathsf{p} L^\dagger Q^\dagger QL + \sigma^2 I)^{-1}. \tag{54}$$

The value of D is equal to $\mathtt{Tr}(C_e)/2$ from (45) and if we use (49), it follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathsf{D} = \mathtt{Tr}(C_e) &= \mathtt{Tr}\left(\mathsf{p} I - \mathsf{p}^2 L^\dagger Q^\dagger \Pi QL\right) \\ &= 2N\mathsf{p} - \mathsf{p}\cdot\mathtt{Tr}\left((\mathsf{p} QL\Pi L^\dagger Q^\dagger\right) \qquad (55) \\ &= 2N\mathsf{p} - \mathsf{p}\cdot\mathtt{Tr}\left(\Pi(\mathsf{p} QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger)\right) \\ &= 2N\mathsf{p} - \mathsf{p}\cdot\mathtt{Tr}\left(I - \sigma^2\Pi\right) \qquad (56) \\ &= (2N - M)\mathsf{p} + \mathsf{p}\sigma^2 \mathtt{Tr}\left(\Pi\right), \qquad (57) \end{aligned}$$

where (55) results from the fact that the trace operator is invariant under cyclic permutations. If $M \leq 2N$, by setting $\sigma = 0$, we get a distortion $(2N - M)\mathsf{p}/2$ regardless of $t_i's$ (as long as they are distinct). When $M > 2N$, from (56), one can observe that distortion becomes arbitrary small as $\sigma \to 0$.

Equivalently, D can be found using (53) as

$$2\mathsf{D} = \mathtt{Tr}(C_e) = \mathsf{p}\sigma^2\mathtt{Tr}(\Gamma). \tag{58}$$

The main challenge is to find the minimum of $\mathtt{Tr}(\Pi)$ or $\mathtt{Tr}(\Gamma)$ over all choices of t_i's and all pre-sampling filters. Note that the matrix Π^{-1} equals to $(\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)$, where the entries of the matrix $(\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger)$ for $1 \leq i, k \leq M$ are of the following form:

$$[\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger](i,k) = \mathsf{p}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} a_\ell \cos(\ell\omega_0(t_i - t_k)), \tag{59}$$

in which $a_\ell = H_R^2(\ell\omega_0) + H_I^2(\ell\omega_0) = |H(\ell\omega_0)|^2$ and $a_\ell \leq 1$ for $\ell = N_1, \ldots, N_2$ (see (8)). Also, a direct calculation shows that the diagonal entries of matrix $\Gamma^{-1} = (\mathsf{p}L^\dagger Q^\dagger QL + \sigma^2 I)$ are given by:

$$\Gamma^{-1}(k,k) = \begin{cases} \sigma^2 + \mathsf{p}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\big[H_R^2(\ell\omega_0)\cos^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i) \\ \quad -2H_R(\ell\omega_0)H_I(\ell\omega_0)\cos(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\sin(\ell\omega_0 t_i) + H_I^2(\ell\omega_0)\sin^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\big]; \\ \qquad\qquad \text{where } \ell = k + N_1 - 1 \text{ for } k = 1, \cdots, N, \\ \sigma^2 + \mathsf{p}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\big[H_I^2(\ell\omega_0)\cos^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i) \\ \quad +2H_R(\ell\omega_0)H_I(\ell\omega_0)\cos(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\sin(\ell\omega_0 t_i) + H_R^2(\ell\omega_0)\sin^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\big]; \\ \qquad\qquad \text{where } \ell = k + N_1 - 1 - N \text{ for } k = N+1, \cdots, 2N. \end{cases} \tag{60}$$

Computing variance of distortion:

The variance of distortion, using the Parseval's theorem given in (44), is of the form

$$\mathsf{V} = \mathsf{Var}\left\{\frac{1}{T}\int_{t=0}^{T} |\hat{S}(t) - S(t)|^2 dt\right\} = \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{Var}\{\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|^2\}. \tag{61}$$

Using Theorem 9 from Appendix A, we have

$$\mathsf{Var}(\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|^2) = 2\mathtt{Tr}(C_e^2). \tag{62}$$

Hence, using similar steps as the ones used in computing average distortion, from (49), V is found to be

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{V} = \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{Var}(\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|^2) &= \mathtt{Tr}(C_e^2) \\ &= \mathtt{Tr}\left((\mathsf{p}I - \mathsf{p}^2 L^\dagger Q^\dagger \Pi QL)^2\right) \\ &= \mathsf{p}^2\mathtt{Tr}\left(I - 2\mathsf{p}L^\dagger Q^\dagger \Pi QL + (\mathsf{p}L^\dagger Q^\dagger \Pi QL)^2\right) \\ &= \mathsf{p}^2[2N + \mathtt{Tr}\left(-2\mathsf{p}L^\dagger Q^\dagger \Pi QL + (\mathsf{p}L^\dagger Q^\dagger \Pi QL)^2\right)] \\ &= \mathsf{p}^2[2N + \mathtt{Tr}\left(-2\Pi\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + (\Pi\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger)^2\right)] \\ &= \mathsf{p}^2[2N - \mathtt{Tr}(I_{M\times M}) + \mathtt{Tr}\left(I_{M\times M} - 2\Pi\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + (\Pi\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger)^2\right)] \\ &= \mathsf{p}^2[2N - M + \mathtt{Tr}((I - \Pi\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger)^2)] \\ &= \mathsf{p}^2[2N - M + \mathtt{Tr}(\sigma^2\Pi)^2] \\ &= \mathsf{p}^2[2N - M + \sigma^4\mathtt{Tr}(\Pi^2)]. \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

Alternatively, using (53), we get

$$\mathsf{V} = \mathtt{Tr}(C_e^2) = \mathsf{p}^2\sigma^4\mathtt{Tr}(\Gamma^2). \tag{64}$$

So far, two closed formulas for D and V have been derived in equations (57), (58), (63) and (64). In the following subsections, the proof of the main results will be developed using the notation and formulas given in this subsection.

B.2 Proof of Lemma 2 (Section 4.1)

The matrix $\Pi^{-1} = (\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)$ is positive definite and real, since $\sigma > 0$. In addition, the entries of matrix $(\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger)$ as stated in (59) are of the form

$$[\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger](i,k) = \mathsf{p}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} a_\ell \cos(\ell\omega_0(t_i - t_k)),$$

where $a_\ell = H_R^2(\ell\omega_0) + H_I^2(\ell\omega_0) = |H(\ell\omega_0)|^2$ and $a_\ell \leq 1$ for $\ell = N_1, \ldots, N_2$. Therefore, all the diagonal entries of matrix $(\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)$ are $(\mathsf{p}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} a_\ell + \sigma^2)$ which are less than or equal to $N\mathsf{p} + \sigma^2$ for $i = 1, \cdots, M$. Using Peierl's inequality (see Lemma 1 in Section 2) for the convex function $f(x) = x^{-1}$ on $x > 0$, the positive matrix Π^{-1} and the normal basis u_j's $(j = 1, \cdots, M)$, where $u_j = (0, \cdots, 0, 1, 0, \cdots, 0)$ is the unit vector with 1 in the j'th position and 0 elsewhere, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathtt{Tr}\,(\Pi) &= \mathtt{Tr}\left(f(\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)\right) \qquad (65)\\
&\geq \sum_{j=1}^{M} f(\langle u_j, \Pi^{-1} u_j\rangle)\\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{M} (\Pi^{-1}(j,j))^{-1}\\
&\geq \frac{M}{N\mathsf{p} + \sigma^2}. \qquad (66)
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (66) into (57), results in a lower bound on distortion as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
2D &= (2N - M)\mathsf{p} + p\sigma^2 \mathtt{Tr}\,((\Pi)\\
&\geq (2N - M)\mathsf{p} + \mathsf{p}\frac{\sigma^2 M}{N\mathsf{p} + \sigma^2}\\
&= (2N - M)\mathsf{p} + \mathsf{p}\frac{M}{1 + SNR}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since sampling time instances t_i's and pre-sampling filter $H(\omega)$ are arbitrary, for any value of M, we get

$$\frac{\mathsf{D}_{\min}}{\mathsf{p}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(2N - M + \frac{M}{1 + SNR}\right). \qquad (67)$$

Since $f(x) = x^{-1}$ is a strictly convex function for $x > 0$, equality in the above equation holds if and only if u_j's are eigenvectors of Π^{-1}, *i.e.,* if and only if Π^{-1} is a diagonal matrix. In particular, assuming that that we do not use a pre-sampling filter on the signal bandwidth *i.e.,* $LL^\dagger = I$, equality holds if and only if $QQ^\dagger$ is a diagonal matrix. Therefor, we have the following equation for $1 \leq k < i \leq M$:

$$\begin{aligned}
[QQ^\dagger](i,k) &= \sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} \cos(\ell\omega_0(t_i - t_k))\\
&= \mathsf{Real}\{\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} e^{j2\pi\frac{t_i - t_k}{T}\ell}\}\\
&= \mathsf{Real}\{e^{j\pi\frac{t_i - t_k}{T}(N_1+N_2)}.\ \frac{\sin(\pi\frac{t_i - t_k}{T}N)}{\sin(\pi\frac{t_i - t_k}{T})}\}\\
&= \cos(\pi\frac{t_i - t_k}{T}(N_1 + N_2)).\ \frac{\sin(\pi\frac{t_i - t_k}{T}N)}{\sin(\pi\frac{t_i - t_k}{T})} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the sampling time instances t_i's should satisfy the following equations:

$$\begin{cases}
\sin(\pi N\frac{(t_i - t_k)}{T}) = 0,\\
\qquad \text{or}\\
\cos(\pi(N_1 + N_2)\frac{(t_i - t_k)}{T}) = 0.
\end{cases} \qquad (68)$$

Thus, given any i and j, we should either have

$$|t_i - t_j| = T\frac{m_1}{N}, \qquad \text{for some integer } m_1,$$

or

$$|t_i - t_j| = T\frac{2m_2+1}{2(N_1+N_2)}, \qquad \text{for some integer } m_2.$$

Derivation of the lower bound for variance:
Similarly, the lower bound on variance is developed. Let $f(x) = x^{-2}$. Then,

$$\mathtt{Tr}\left(\Pi^2\right) = \mathtt{Tr}\left(f(\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)\right) \geq \sum_{j=1}^{M} (\Pi(j,j))^{-2} \geq \frac{M}{(N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)^2}.$$

Hence, using (63), we have

$$\mathsf{V}_{\min} \geq \mathsf{p}^2\left[2N - M + \sigma^4\frac{M}{(N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)^2}\right] = \mathsf{p}^2\left[2N - M + \frac{M}{(1+SNR)^2}\right].$$

Here again, equality holds if and only if Π^{-1} is a diagonal matrix.

Remark 6 From the proof, one can see that the lower bounds given in Lemma 2 are achieved if and only if matrix Π (defined in (50)) is diagonal for the optimizing t_i's and the pre-sampling filter.

B.3 Proof of Lemma 3 (Section 4.1)

We use the distortion formula given in (58) and minimize distortion subject to the sampling locations and the pre-sampling filter. Let $f(x) = x^{-1}$ for $x > 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{D}_{\min} &= \min_{H(.),\{t_i,i=1,\cdots,M\}} [\frac{1}{2}\mathsf{p}\sigma^2\mathtt{Tr}(\Gamma)] \\
&= \min_{H(.),\{t_i,i=1,\cdots,M\}} [\frac{1}{2}\mathsf{p}\sigma^2\mathtt{Tr}(f(\Gamma^{-1}))] \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{p}\sigma^2 \min_{H(.),\{t_i,i=1,\cdots,M\}} \sum_{k=1}^{2N} f(\Gamma^{-1}(k,k)) \qquad (69)\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{p}\sigma^2 \min_{H(.),\{t_i,i=1,\cdots,M\}} \sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} \frac{1}{\eta_\ell} + \frac{1}{\gamma_\ell}, \qquad (70)
\end{aligned}$$

where (69) follows from the Peierl's inequality (Lemma 1) for the covex function f, and (70) is written by using (60) with the following values for η_ℓ and γ_ℓ:

$$\eta_\ell = \sigma^2 + \mathsf{p}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(H_R^2(\ell\omega_0)\cos^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i) - 2H_R(\ell\omega_0)H_I(\ell\omega_0)\cos(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\sin(\ell\omega_0 t_i) + H_I^2(\ell\omega_0)\sin^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\right), \quad (71)$$

and

$$\gamma_\ell = \sigma^2 + \mathsf{p}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(H_I^2(\ell\omega_0)\cos^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i) + 2H_R(\ell\omega_0)H_I(\ell\omega_0)\cos(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\sin(\ell\omega_0 t_i) + H_R^2(\ell\omega_0)\sin^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\right). \quad (72)$$

Observe that

$$\eta_\ell + \gamma_\ell = 2\sigma^2 + M\mathsf{p}a_\ell$$

where $a_\ell = |H(\ell\omega_0)|^2 = H_R^2(\ell\omega_0) + H_I^2(\ell\omega_0)$ for $\ell = N_1, \ldots, N_2$.

Next, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\mathsf{p}\sigma^2 \min_{H(.),\{t_i,i=1,\cdots,M\}} \sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} \frac{1}{\eta_\ell} + \frac{1}{\gamma_\ell} &\geq \min_{0\leq a_\ell\leq 1} \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{p}\sigma^2 \sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} \frac{2}{\sigma^2 + \frac{M\mathsf{p}}{2}.a_\ell} \qquad (73)\\
&= \mathsf{p}\sigma^2 \sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} \frac{1}{\sigma^2 + \frac{M\mathsf{p}}{2}} \\
&= \frac{N\sigma^2\mathsf{p}}{\sigma^2 + \frac{M\mathsf{p}}{2}} \\
&= \frac{N\mathsf{p}}{1 + \frac{M}{2N}SNR},
\end{aligned}$$

where (73) results from the following inequality

$$\frac{1}{a}+\frac{1}{b}\geq\frac{2}{\frac{a+b}{2}}, \tag{74}$$

for nonzero values of a and b.

The proof for the variance is similar. Using (64), and the Peierl's inequality for the choice of $f(x)=x^{-2}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{V}_{\min} &= \min_{H(.),\{t_i,i=1,\cdots,M\}}[\mathsf{p}^2\sigma^4\mathtt{Tr}(\Gamma^2)]\\
&= \min_{H(.),\{t_i,i=1,\cdots,M\}}[\frac{1}{2}\mathsf{p}\sigma^2\mathtt{Tr}(f(\Gamma^{-1}))]\\
&\geq \mathsf{p}^2\sigma^4\min_{H(.),\{t_i,i=1,\cdots,M\}}\sum_{k=1}^{2N}f(\Gamma^{-1}(k,k))\\
&= \mathsf{p}^2\sigma^4\min_{H(.),\{t_i,i=1,\cdots,M\}}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2}\frac{1}{\eta_\ell^2}+\frac{1}{\gamma_\ell^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where η_ℓ and γ_ℓ are given in (104) and (105). From the convexity of the function $1/x^2$ we have

$$\frac{1}{a^2}+\frac{1}{b^2}\geq\frac{2}{(\frac{a+b}{2})^2}=\frac{8}{(a+b)^2},$$

for nonzero values of a and b. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{V}_{\min} &\geq \mathsf{p}^2\sigma^4\min_{H(.),\{t_i,i=1,\cdots,M\}}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2}\frac{8}{(\eta_\ell+\gamma_\ell)^2}\\
&= \min_{0\leq a_\ell\leq 1}\mathsf{p}^2\sigma^4\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2}\frac{8}{(2\sigma^2+M\mathsf{p}a_\ell)^2}\\
&= \mathsf{p}^2\sigma^4\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2}\frac{8}{(2\sigma^2+M\mathsf{p})^2}\\
&= N\mathsf{p}^2\sigma^4\frac{8}{(2\sigma^2+M\mathsf{p})^2}\\
&= N\mathsf{p}^2\frac{2}{(1+\frac{M\mathsf{p}}{2\sigma^2})^2}\\
&= \frac{2N\mathsf{p}^2}{(1+\frac{M}{2N}SNR)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Necessary and Sufficient conditions for tightness of the lower bounds: The ideas are similar to the ones given in the proof of Lemma 2. For Pierel's inequality to be tight, we need Γ^{-1} defined in (54) to be a diagonal matrix. We further need $\eta_\ell=\gamma_\ell$ to have all the inequalities as equalities. We also need $a_\ell=|H(\ell\omega_0)|^2=1$ for all ℓ, implying that $LL^\dagger=I$. Therefore, the equality holds if and only if matrix $(\mathsf{p}Q^\dagger Q+\sigma^2 I)$ is diagonal, and all of its diagonal entries are equal.

The off-diagonal and diagonal entries of $(\mathsf{p}Q^\dagger Q+\sigma^2 I)$ are given by

$$[\mathsf{p}Q^\dagger Q+\sigma^2 I](i,k)=\begin{cases}
\mathsf{p}\cdot\sum_{\ell=1}^{M}\cos((N_1+i-1)\omega_0 t_\ell)\cos((N_1+k-1)\omega_0 t_\ell) & ;\ 1\leq i<k\leq N\\
\mathsf{p}\cdot\sum_{\ell=1}^{M}\cos((N_1+i-1)\omega_0 t_\ell)\sin((N_1+k-N)\omega_0 t_\ell) & ;\ 1\leq i\leq N\leq k\leq 2N\\
\mathsf{p}\cdot\sum_{\ell=1}^{M}\sin((N_1+i-N)\omega_0 t_\ell)\sin((N_1+k-N)\omega_0 t_\ell) & ;\ N\leq i\leq 2N,\ N\leq k\leq 2N
\end{cases},$$

$$[\mathsf{p}Q^\dagger Q+\sigma^2](i,i)=\begin{cases}
\frac{M\mathsf{p}}{2}+\sigma^2+\frac{\mathsf{p}}{2}\cdot\sum_{\ell=1}^{M}\cos(2(N_1+i-1)\omega_0 t_\ell) & ;\ 1\leq i\leq N\\
\frac{M\mathsf{p}}{2}+\sigma^2-\frac{\mathsf{p}}{2}\cdot\sum_{\ell=1}^{M}\cos(2(N_1+i-1)\omega_0 t_\ell) & ;\ N\leq i\leq 2N
\end{cases},$$

respectively. If we put the off-diagonal entries zero and write the above equations in a simpler form, we get

$$\begin{cases}
\sum_{\ell=1}^{M}\cos((N_1+k_1)\omega_0 t_\ell)\cos((N_1+k_2)\omega_0 t_\ell)=0 & ;\ \ 0\leq k_1<k_2\leq N-1\\
\sum_{\ell=1}^{M}\cos((N_1+k_1)\omega_0 t_\ell)\sin((N_1+k_2)\omega_0 t_\ell)=0 & ;\ \ 0\leq k_1,k_2\leq N-1\\
\sum_{\ell=1}^{M}\sin((N_1+k_1)\omega_0 t_\ell)\sin((N_1+k_2)\omega_0 t_\ell)=0 & ;\ \ 0\leq k_1<k_2\leq N-1
\end{cases}. \tag{75}$$

Substituting $\omega_0 = 2\pi/T$ in the above equations, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{\ell=1}^{M} e^{j2\pi(k_1-k_2)\frac{t_\ell}{T}} = 0 \;\; ; \;\; 0 \le k_1 < k_2 \le N-1 \\ \sum_{\ell=1}^{M} e^{j2\pi(2N_1+k_1+k_2)\frac{t_\ell}{T}} = 0 \;\; ; \;\; 0 \le k_1 \le k_2 \le N-1 \end{cases},$$

or in another form, we have

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^{M} e^{j2\pi k\frac{t_i}{T}} = 0 \quad \text{for} \;\; 0 < k \le N-1 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{M} e^{j2\pi k\frac{t_i}{T}} = 0 \quad \text{for} \;\; 2N_1 \le k \le 2N_2 \end{cases}. \tag{76}$$

These equations imply that the off-diagonal entries are all zero. But they also imply that the diagonal entries are all equal to zero, *i.e.,*

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{M} \cos(2(N_1+i-1)\omega_0 t_\ell) = 0, \qquad 1 \le i \le 2N.$$

B.4 Proof of Theorem 4 (Section 4.2)

Here we are in the case of $M \le N$. In Lemma 2, the desired lower bounds on $\mathsf{D}_{\min}$ and $\mathsf{V}_{\min}$ were developed. Moreover, we showed that these lower bounds are achievable if we do not use the pre-sampling filter and for any time instances t_i or t_j

$$|t_i - t_j| = T\frac{m_1}{N}, \qquad \text{for some integer } m_1, \tag{77}$$

$$\textit{or} \quad |t_i - t_j| = T\frac{2m_2+1}{2(N_1+N_2)}, \qquad \text{for some integer } m_2. \tag{78}$$

From (77), we conclude that any arbitrary choice of time instances from the set

$$\{\tau, \tau + \frac{1}{N}T, \tau + \frac{2}{N}T, \tau + \frac{3}{N}T, \cdots, \tau + \frac{N-1}{N}T\}$$

is optimal.

To find the interpolation formula, consider the MMSE estimator given in (46) and the matrix W in (48). Thus, we have

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}} = W\mathbf{Y} = \mathsf{p}L^\dagger Q^\dagger \Pi \mathbf{Y}.$$

Since in the optimal case, $L = I$ and $\Pi = (\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)^{-1} = (N\mathsf{p} + \sigma^2)^{-1} I$, the Fourier coefficients of the reconstructed signal are as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \frac{\mathsf{p}}{N\mathsf{p} + \sigma^2} Q^\dagger \mathbf{Y},$$

which results in the desired reconstruction formula in (16).

B.5 Proof of Proposition 1 (Section 4.2)

Remember the lower bounds given in Lemma 2. We showed that, when we do not use a pre-sampling filter, equality in this lemma holds if and only if

$$|t_i - t_j| = T\frac{m}{N}, \qquad \text{for some integer } m, \tag{79}$$

$$|t_i - t_j| = T\frac{2m+1}{2(N_1+N_2)}, \qquad \text{for some integer } m. \tag{80}$$

It remains to show that when $M \le N$ and N does not divide $N_1 + N_2$, we have the following statement: one can find $M-1$ sampling times whose pairwise differences satisfy (79). Without loss of generality assume that $t_1 = 0$. For any t_i, t_j, the differences $t_i - t_1$, $t_j - t_1$ cannot simultaneously satisfy (80), since then $t_i - t_j$ will be of the form $T(2m_i - 2m_j)/(2(N_1+N_2))$ and this is an invalid pairwise distance. Therefore, at least $M-1$ points should satisfy $t_i - t_1$ with (79). This completes the proof.

B.6 Proof of Theorem 5 (Section 4.2)

Assuming sampling points

$$\{t_1, t_2, t_3, \cdots, t_M\} = \{0, \frac{1}{M}T, \frac{2}{M}T, \frac{3}{M}T, \cdots, \frac{M-1}{M}T\}$$

and using the pre-sampling filter $H_2(\omega)$, the entries of matrix $\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger$ in (59) will be

$$[\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger](i,k) = \mathsf{p}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} a_\ell \cos(\ell\omega_0(t_i - t_k)) = M\mathsf{p}\cdot\mathbf{1}[i=k].$$

Hence $\Pi = (\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)^{-1} = \frac{1}{M\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2} I$. Using formula (57), distortion is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{D}_{H_2} &= \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{p}\left(2N - M + \sigma^2 \mathtt{Tr}(\Pi)\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{p}\left(2N - M + \sigma^2 \frac{M}{M\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{p}\left(2N - M + \frac{M}{1+\frac{M}{N}SNR}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

where $SNR = N\mathsf{p}/\sigma^2$. Next, consider using the pre-sampling filter $H_1(\omega)$. In this case, the diagonal entries of matrix Π are $M\mathsf{p}/2$. But Π is not diagonal:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi(2,1) &= \mathsf{p}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} a_\ell \cos(\ell\omega_0(t_2 - t_1)) \\
&= \mathsf{p}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_1+M/2-1} \cos(\frac{\ell\omega_0 T}{M}) \\
&= \mathsf{p}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_1+M/2-1} \cos(\frac{2\pi\ell}{M}) \\
&= -\mathsf{p}\frac{\sin\left(\frac{(2N_1-1)\pi}{2M}\right)}{\sin(\frac{\pi}{M})},
\end{aligned}$$

and since M is even, $\Pi(2,1) \neq 0$. Hence the equality condition in the Peierl's inequality (Lemma 1) is not satisfied and the distortion is bounded below as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{D}_{H_1} &= \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{p}\left(2N - M + \sigma^2 \mathtt{Tr}(\Pi)\right) \\
&> \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{p}\left(2N - M + \sigma^2 \frac{M}{\frac{M\mathsf{p}}{2}+\sigma^2}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{p}\left(2N - M + \frac{M}{1+\frac{M}{2N}SNR}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

Comparing (81) and (82), we conclude that D_{H_1} is strictly greater than D_{H_2}.

B.7 Proof of Theorem 6 (Section 4.3)

Here we are in the case of $N < M \leq 2N$. Lemma 2 implies that

$$\frac{\mathsf{D}_{\min}}{\mathsf{p}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(2N - M + \frac{M}{1+SNR}\right).$$

When $M \leq 2N$ and $N|2N_1 - 1$, we have $N|N_1 + N_2$, and using conditions (9) and (10) from the statement of Lemma 2, one can then verify that a set of optimal time instances is

$$\begin{aligned}
\{t_1, t_2, t_3, \cdots, t_M\} \subset \Big\{&0, \frac{1}{N}T, \frac{2}{N}T, \cdots, \frac{N-1}{N}T, \\
&\frac{T}{2(N_1+N_2)}, \frac{1}{N}T + \frac{T}{2(N_1+N_2)}, \frac{2}{N}T + \frac{T}{2(N_1+N_2)}, \cdots, \frac{N-1}{N}T + \frac{T}{2(N_1+N_2)}\Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

To prove the upper bound, we choose not to utilize a pre-sampling filter and use the following M samples points

$$\{0, \frac{1}{N}T, \frac{2}{N}T, \frac{3}{N}T, \cdots, \frac{N-1}{N}T, \quad \frac{1}{2N}T, \frac{3}{2N}T, \cdots, \frac{2M-2N-1}{2N}T\}.$$

Using (59) and the fact that $a_\ell = 1$, and $t_i = (i-1/N)T$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$ and $t_i = T(2(i-N)-1)/2N$ for $N+1 \leq i \leq M$, one can verify that the matrix $(\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)$ is of the form

$$\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I = \begin{bmatrix} (N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)\ \mathbf{I}_{N\times N} & \mathsf{p}\ \mathbf{G}_{N\times(M-N)} \\ \\ \mathsf{p}\ \mathbf{G}^\dagger_{(M-N)\times N} & (N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)\ \mathbf{I}_{(M-N)\times(M-N)} \end{bmatrix}_{M\times M},$$

where $\mathbf{G}$ is an $N \times (M-N)$ matrix whose $(M-N)$ columns are the first $(M-N)$ columns of the matrix $\Phi_{N\times N}$ defined as follows: Φ is an $N \times N$ circulant matrix with the first row $\mathbf{c} = [c_0,\ c_1,\ ...,\ c_{N-1}]$ where

$$c_k = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} \left(\omega^{-(2k+1)\ell} + \omega^{(2k+1)\ell}\right) \tag{83}$$

in which $\omega = \exp(j\pi/N)$. For instance, when $N_1 = 1$, Φ is an $N \times N$ matrix with all -1 entries.

Using Lemma 4 that appears later in this subsection, the eigenvalues of $(\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)$ are equal to $(N\mathsf{p} + \sigma^2 + ps_i)$ and $(N\mathsf{p} + \sigma^2 - ps_i)$ (where s_i's are the singular values of $\mathbf{G}_{N\times(M-N)}$), in addition to $M - 2(M-N) = 2N - M$ eigenvalues $N\mathsf{p} + \sigma^2$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathtt{Tr}(\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)^{-1} &= \frac{2N-M}{N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2} + \sum_{i=1}^{M-N}\left(\frac{1}{N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2-ps_i} + \frac{1}{N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2+ps_i}\right) \\ &= \frac{2N-M}{N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2} + \sum_{i=1}^{M-N}\frac{2(N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)}{(N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)^2 - p^2 s_i^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

To compute an upper bound on $\mathtt{Tr}(\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)^{-1}$, we need to find an upper bound on s_i's. To do so, first we assume that $M = 2N$, and find the singular values of the circulant matrix Φ (named δ_i for $i = 1, \cdots, N$) and then use them to find an upper bound on the singular values of matrix $\mathbf{G}_{N\times(M-N)}$.

Singular values of Φ are the eigenvalues of $(\Phi\Phi^\dagger)^{1/2}$. Theorem 1 states that any two circulant matrices commute and the eigenvalues of their product is the pairwise product of their eigenvalues. Since both Φ and $\Phi^\dagger$ are circulant matrices, we conclude that $\Phi\Phi^\dagger$ is also a circulant matrix with eigenvalues $|\lambda_i|^2, i = 1, ..., N$ where λ_i's are eigenvalues of Φ. Therefore, $\delta_i = |\lambda_i|$ for $i = 1, \cdots, N$. Using Theorem 2, λ_i's are given by

$$\lambda_i = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} c_k \omega^{-2ki}, \qquad i = 1, 2, \cdots, N \tag{85}$$

where $\omega = \exp(j\pi/N)$. Substituting c_k from (83) into (85), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_i &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\ \Big[\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2}\left(\omega^{-(2k+1)\ell} + \omega^{(2k+1)\ell}\right)\Big]\ \omega^{-2ki} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2}\omega^{-\ell}\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\omega^{-2k(\ell+i)} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2}\omega^{\ell}\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\omega^{2k(\ell-i)}. \end{aligned}$$

We then have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\omega^{-2k(\ell+i)} = \begin{cases} N & ; \quad N\ |\ell+i \\ 0 & ; \quad N \nmid \ell+i \end{cases}, \tag{86}$$

and

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\omega^{2k(\ell-i)} = \begin{cases} N & ; \quad N\ |\ell-i \\ 0 & ; \quad N \nmid \ell-i \end{cases}. \tag{87}$$

Given any arbitrary i, $\ell+i \in [N_1+i : N_2+i]$ are N consecutive numbers, and only one of them is divisible by N. Let ℓ_1, ℓ_2 be unique numbers in $[N_1 : N_2]$ such that $N|\ell_1+i$ and $N|\ell_2-i$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_i &= \frac{N}{2}\omega^{-\ell_1} + \frac{N}{2}\omega^{\ell_2} \\ &= \frac{N}{2}\omega^{(\ell_2-\ell_1)/2}(\omega^{-(\ell_2+\ell_1)/2} + \omega^{(\ell_2+\ell_1)/2}) \\ &= N\omega^{(\ell_2-\ell_1)/2}\cos(\frac{(\ell_2+\ell_1)\pi}{2N}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $|\lambda_i| = N|\cos(\frac{(\ell_2+\ell_1)\pi}{2N})|$. From $N|\ell_1+i$ and $N|\ell_2-i$, we have that $N|\ell_1+\ell_2$. But $\ell_1+\ell_2 \in [2N_1 : 2N_2]$ consists of $2N_2-2N_1+1 = 2N-1$ consecutive natural numbers, and there cannot be more than two numbers that are divisible by N in $[2N_1 : 2N_2]$. If $\ell_1+\ell_2 = kN$, we will have

$$|\lambda_i| = N|\cos(\frac{k\pi}{2})| = \begin{cases} N & ; \quad k \text{ is even} \\ 0 & ; \quad k \text{ is odd} \end{cases} .$$

Therefore, we need to find out for the number of values of i, $|\lambda_i|$ is zero, and for the number values of i that $|\lambda_i|$ is N.

Assume that $N_1 = qN+r$. Then $N_1+i = qN+r+i$ and $N_1-i = qN+r-i$. Therefore

$$\ell_1 = \begin{cases} N_1+N-(r+i) & r+i \le N \\ N_1+2N-(r+i) & r+i > N \end{cases}, \tag{88}$$

$$\ell_2 = \begin{cases} N_1 & i-r = N \\ N_1+i-r & N-1 \ge i-r \ge 0 \\ N_1+N-(r-i) & i-r < 0 \end{cases}, \tag{89}$$

By considering different cases, one gets that the number of values of i where $|\lambda_i|$ is N is equal to $f(N_1, N)$ where

$$f(a,b) = \begin{cases} b-1 & \text{if } r = 0 \\ 2b-2r+1 & \text{if } 2r > b \\ 2r-1 & \text{if } 0 < 2r \le b \end{cases},$$

where q and r are the quotient and remainder of dividing a by b.

Now for $N < M \le 2N$, we use Theorem 3 for matrix Φ with singular values $\delta_1 \ge \delta_2, \cdots \ge \delta_N$ and submatrix $\mathbf{G}_{N\times(M-N)}$ with singular values $s_1 \ge s_2, \cdots \ge s_{M-N}$. Therefore,

$$\delta_i \ge s_i \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, M-N,$$

thus, $\mathbf{G}_{N\times(M-N)}$ has at most $\mathsf{Num} = \min\big(f(N_1,N), M-N\big)$ non-zero singular values. Furthermore the absolute value of non-zero eigenvalues of $\mathbf{G}$ is less than or equal to N. Using this upper bound on s_i's and substituting it into (84), we get

$$\mathtt{Tr}(\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)^{-1} = \frac{2N-M}{N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2} + \sum_{i=1}^{M-N} \frac{2(N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)}{(N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)^2 - p^2 s_i^2} \tag{90}$$

$$\le \frac{2N-M}{N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2} + \mathsf{Num}\frac{2(N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)}{(N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)^2 - p^2N^2} + (M-N-\mathsf{Num})\frac{2}{(N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)}, \tag{91}$$

Thus, (57) would be

$$2D = (2N-M)\mathsf{p} + \mathsf{p}\sigma^2 \cdot \mathtt{Tr}(\mathsf{p}QLL^\dagger Q^\dagger + \sigma^2 I)^{-1} \tag{92}$$

$$\le (2N-M)\mathsf{p} + \mathsf{p}\sigma^2\left\{\frac{2N-M}{N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2} + \mathsf{Num}\cdot\frac{2(N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)}{(N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)^2 - p^2N^2} + (M-N-\mathsf{Num})\cdot\frac{2}{(N\mathsf{p}+\sigma^2)}\right\}, \tag{93}$$

which results in the following upper bound

$$\frac{\mathsf{D}_{\min}}{\mathsf{p}} \le \frac{1}{2}(2N-M) + \frac{2N-M}{2(1+SNR)} + \mathsf{Num}\cdot\frac{1+SNR}{1+2\,SNR} + (M-N-\mathsf{Num})\cdot\frac{1}{1+SNR}.$$

This concludes the proof of the upper bound.

Lemma 4 *Consider a matrix of the block form*

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} I & G \\ G^\dagger & I \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then for any singular value s of matrix G, both $1+s$ and $1-s$ are eigenvalues of matrix P. Conversely, each eigenvalue of P that is not equal to one, can be expressed as $1+s$ or $1-s$ for a singular value s of matrix G.

Proof:

Assume that $G = U\Lambda V$ is the singular value decomposition of G for some unitary matrices U and V, and diagonal matrix Λ. Then

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & G \\ G^\dagger & I \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} U & I \\ I & V \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & \Lambda \\ \Lambda^\dagger & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} U^\dagger & I \\ I & V^\dagger \end{bmatrix}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{bmatrix} U & I \\ I & V \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} U^{-1} & I \\ I & V^{-1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} U^\dagger & I \\ I & V^\dagger \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore we need to find the eigenvalues of

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & \Lambda \\ \Lambda^\dagger & I \end{bmatrix}.$$

This matrix is a concatenations of 2×2 matrices of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & s \\ s & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

whose eigenvalues are $1+s$ and $1-s$, and of matrices of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

whose eigenvalues are 1. □

B.8 Proof of Theorem 7 (Section 4.4)

Consider the proof of Lemma 3 in which the alternative lower bound on average and variance of distortion the necessary and sufficient conditions for their tightness were derived. With uniform sampling, *i.e.,* $t_i = \frac{iT}{M}, i = 1, 2, \cdots, M$, when $2N_1 + \alpha + \beta \nmid M$ for integers $0 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq N-1$, matrix Γ will be diagonal with diagonal entries $(\sigma^2 + \frac{M\mathsf{p}}{2} a_\ell)$. If we also choose $a_\ell = 1$ for $\ell = N_1 \cdots N_2$, inequalities (69) and (73) become equalities and thus this lower bounds will be tight.

To derive the reconstruction formula, we use (46) and the alternative form for linear MMSE estimator given in (51). For the optimal case, where $L = I$ and $\Gamma = (Mp/2 + \sigma^2)^{-1} I$, we have

$$W = \mathsf{p}\Gamma L^\dagger Q^\dagger = \frac{\mathsf{p}}{\frac{M\mathsf{p}}{2} + \sigma^2} Q^\dagger \tag{94}$$

and thus

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}} = W\mathbf{Y} = \frac{\mathsf{p}}{\frac{M\mathsf{p}}{2} + \sigma^2} Q^\dagger \mathbf{Y}. \tag{95}$$

The estimated coefficients vector, $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$, results in the reconstruction formula given in (29).

B.9 Proof of Theorem 8 (Section 4.5)

To estimate the input signal, one should estimate the vector of coefficients $\mathbf{X}$ given in (41). Now, given a fixed set of sampling locations and a pre-sampling filter, we will have a vector of samples $\mathbf{Y}$. The best MMSE estimator of the vector of coefficients $\mathbf{X}$ at the encoder is equal to $W\mathbf{Y}$, where W was given in (46). Our goal is to show that the encoder should compute this estimate and use it to create the n_c compressed bits.

To show this, let us fix an encoding strategy. Then we show that the MMSE decoder for estimating the signal coefficients, is the same as the MMSE decoder for estimating $W\mathbf{Y}$. To see this, let us use random variable

$\mathbf{B}$ to denote the n_c compressed bits. Having received the value $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{b}$, the optimal MMSE estimate of the vector of coefficients is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{b}) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{b}\} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{y}} p_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{b}) \cdot \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{B}=\mathbf{b}\} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{y}} p_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{b}) \cdot \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{y}\} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{y}} p_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{b}) \cdot W \cdot \mathbf{y} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{W\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{B}=\mathbf{b}\}.\end{aligned}$$

The above equations imply that the decoder can alternatively aim to reconstruct $W\mathbf{Y}$ instead of $\mathbf{X}$; the MMSE estimator for both will be the same. Next, we study the relation between the average distortion for reconstructing $\mathbf{X}$ with that of $W\mathbf{Y}$. The average distortion for reconstructing $\mathbf{X}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{D}_{total} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X},\mathbf{B}}\{\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{B})\|^2\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\|\mathbf{X} - W\mathbf{Y} + W\mathbf{Y} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{B})\|^2\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\|\mathbf{X} - W\mathbf{Y}\|^2\} + \mathbb{E}\{\|W\mathbf{Y} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{B})\|^2\} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\{(\mathbf{X} - W\mathbf{Y})(W\mathbf{Y} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{B})^\dagger)\} + \mathbb{E}\{(W\mathbf{Y} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{B}))(\mathbf{X} - W\mathbf{Y})^\dagger)\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\|\mathbf{X} - W\mathbf{Y}\|^2\} + \mathbb{E}\{\|W\mathbf{Y} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{B})\|^2\} \qquad (96) \\ &= \mathsf{D}_s + \mathsf{D}_c,\end{aligned}$$

where in (96), we used the fact that $\mathbf{X} - W\mathbf{Y}$ is zero-mean and independent of $\mathbf{Y}$. Therefore, it is also independent of $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{B})$, and hence of $W\mathbf{Y} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{B})$.

Observe that the value of D_s does not depend on the encoding strategy. Therefore the two problems of estimating $\mathbf{X}$ and $W\mathbf{Y}$ at the decoder not only have the same estimator, but their resulting MMSE average distortion are directly related to each other by a constant factor. Therefore, it is optimal for both the encoder and decoder to aim to reconstruct and minimize $W\mathbf{Y}$ instead of $\mathbf{X}$ without any loss of generality.

B.10 Proof of Proposition 2 (Section 4.5)

From (44) and (49), we have that $\mathsf{D}_s = \mathtt{Tr}(C_e)/2$. We now prove an information theoretic lower bound on D_c using Shannon's rate distortion theory. The quantity n_c is the required rate for achieving D_c for a single use of the source (one shot problem), and hence it is greater than or equal to the corresponding problem in the asymptotic case. The solution to the asymptotic case is obtained by reverse water-filling on the eigenvalues of the covariance matrix of $W\mathbf{Y}$ [27, p.349]. Therefore, if λ_i's are the eigenvalues of

$$WC_{\mathbf{Y}}W^\dagger = \mathsf{p}I - C_e, \qquad (97)$$

we have

$$n_c \geq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\lambda_i}{\min(\lambda_i, \mu)},$$

where μ is some constant such that $\sum_i \min(\lambda_i, \mu) = \mathsf{D}_c$.

B.11 Proof of Proposition 3 (Section 4.6)

To study non-uniform power constraints, we can use the same mathematical framework given in Section B.1. The only change is that $C_{\mathbf{X}}$ is no longer equal to $\mathsf{p}I$. Here $C_{\mathbf{X}}$ is a diagonal matrix with the following diagonal entries

$$C_{\mathbf{X}}(k,k) = \begin{cases} \mathsf{p}_{k+N_1-1} & ; \quad k = 1, \cdots, N \\ \mathsf{p}_{k+N_1-1-N} & ; \quad k = N+1, \cdots, 2N \end{cases}. \qquad (98)$$

Therefore, (52) results in

$$\begin{aligned} C_e &= (L^\dagger Q^\dagger C_{\mathbf{Z}}^{-1} QL + C_{\mathbf{X}}^{-1})^{-1} \qquad (99) \\ &= (\frac{1}{\sigma^2} L^\dagger Q^\dagger QL + C_{\mathbf{X}})^{-1} \qquad (100) \\ &\triangleq \Gamma'. \qquad (101)\end{aligned}$$

Observe that when $\mathsf{p}_\ell = \mathsf{p}$ for all ℓ, the above Γ' reduces to $\mathsf{p}\sigma^2\Gamma$ given in (54). Expanding the diagonal entries of matrix $\Gamma^{'-1}$, we get that

$$\Gamma^{'-1}(k,k) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\mathsf{p}_\ell} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\big[H_R^2(\ell\omega_0)\cos^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i) \\ \quad -2H_R(\ell\omega_0)H_I(\ell\omega_0)\cos(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\sin(\ell\omega_0 t_i) + H_I^2(\ell\omega_0)\sin^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\big]; \\ \qquad\qquad \text{where } \ell = k + N_1 - 1 \text{ for } k = 1, \cdots, N, \\ \frac{1}{\mathsf{p}_\ell} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\big[H_I^2(\ell\omega_0)\cos^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i) \\ \quad +2H_R(\ell\omega_0)H_I(\ell\omega_0)\cos(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\sin(\ell\omega_0 t_i) + H_R^2(\ell\omega_0)\sin^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\big]; \\ \qquad\qquad \text{where } \ell = k + N_1 - 1 - N \text{ for } k = N+1, \cdots, 2N. \end{cases} \tag{102}$$

which reduces to $\frac{1}{\mathsf{p}\sigma^2}$ times the diagonal entries of Γ^{-1} for the special case of $\mathsf{p}_\ell = \mathsf{p}$ for all ℓ, as given in (60).

Following the same arguments as the ones given in proof of Lemma 3 (Appendix B.3), a lower bound on $\mathsf{D}_{\min}$ is attained below as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{D}_{\min} &= \min_{H(.),\{t_i, i=1,\cdots,M\}} [\frac{1}{2}\mathtt{Tr}(\Gamma')] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\min_{H(.),\{t_i, i=1,\cdots,M\}} \sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} \frac{1}{\eta'_\ell} + \frac{1}{\gamma'_\ell}, \end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

where η'_ℓ and γ'_ℓ are of the forms:

$$\eta'_\ell = \frac{1}{\mathsf{p}_\ell} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\bigg(H_R^2(\ell\omega_0)\cos^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i) - 2H_R(\ell\omega_0)H_I(\ell\omega_0)\cos(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\sin(\ell\omega_0 t_i) + H_I^2(\ell\omega_0)\sin^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\bigg), \tag{104}$$

and

$$\gamma'_\ell = \frac{1}{\mathsf{p}_\ell} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\bigg(H_I^2(\ell\omega_0)\cos^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i) + 2H_R(\ell\omega_0)H_I(\ell\omega_0)\cos(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\sin(\ell\omega_0 t_i) + H_R^2(\ell\omega_0)\sin^2(\ell\omega_0 t_i)\bigg). \tag{105}$$

Observe that

$$\eta'_\ell + \gamma'_\ell = \frac{2}{\mathsf{p}_\ell} + \frac{Ma_\ell}{\sigma^2}$$

where $a_\ell = |H(\ell\omega_0)|^2 = H_R^2(\ell\omega_0) + H_I^2(\ell\omega_0)$ for $\ell = N_1, \ldots, N_2$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 3, using inequality (74) we continue

$$\frac{1}{2}\min_{H(.),\{t_i, i=1,\cdots,M\}} \sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} \frac{1}{\eta_\ell} + \frac{1}{\gamma_\ell} \geq \min_{0\leq a_\ell \leq 1} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} \frac{2}{\frac{1}{\mathsf{p}_\ell} + \frac{Ma_\ell}{2\sigma^2}} \tag{106}$$

$$= \sum_{\ell=N_1}^{N_2} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\mathsf{p}_\ell} + \frac{M}{2\sigma^2}}. \tag{107}$$

Furthermore, the distortion given in (107) is achieved under the same conditions given in Lemma 3 that ensures the matrix $Q^\dagger Q$ becomes diagonal.

The proof of Theorem 7 can be mimicked to show that uniform sampling, *i.e.,* $t_i = iT/M, i = 1, 2, \cdots, M$ is a solution to the above equation if for each k in the interval $2N_1 \leq k \leq 2N_2$, $M \nmid k$. In particular, for the rates above the Nyquist rate, *i.e.,* $M > 2N_2$, uniform sampling is optimal.

References

[1] S. Feizi, V. K. Goyal and M. Medard, "Time-stampless adaptive nonuniform sampling for stochastic signals", IEEE Trans. Signal Process., vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 5440-5450, Oct. 2012.

[2] R.H. Walden, Analog-to-digital converter survey and analysis, IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun., vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 539-550, Apr. 1999.

[3] G. L. Bretthorst, "Nonuniform sampling: Bandwidth and aliasing," in AIP conference proceedings, 2001, pp. 1-28.

[4] H. J. Landau, Necessary density conditions for sampling and interpolation of certain entire functions, Acta Math., vol. 117, pp. 3752, 1967.

[5] F. Marvasti, *Nonuniform Sampling, Theory and Practice*, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York, 2000.

[6] G. Reeves and M. Gastpar, "The Sampling Rate-Distortion Tradeoff for Sparsity Pattern Recovery in Compressed Sensing", IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 3065-3092, May 2012.

[7] A. Kipnis, A. Goldsmith, T. Weissman, Y. Eldar, "Distortion Rate Function of Sub-Nyquist Sampled Gaussian Sources Corrupted by Noise," in Proc. Allerton Conf. on Comm., Control, and Computing, 2013, pp. 901 - 908.

[8] J. Wu and N. Sun. "Optimum sensor density in distortion-tolerant wireless sensor networks," IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun., vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 2056-2064, Jun. 2012.

[9] M. Matthews, "On the linear minimum-mean-squared-error estimation of an undersampled wide-sense stationary random process," IEEE Trans. Signal Process., vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 272-275, Jan. 2000.

[10] D. Chan and R. Donaldson, "Optimum pre- and post-filtering of sampled signals with application to pulse modulation and data compression systems," IEEE Trans. on Commun. Technol., vol. 19, pp. 141-157, Apr. 1971.

[11] V. P. Boda and P. Narayan, "Sampling rate distortion," in Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. on Inf. Theory (ISIT), 2014, pp. 3057 - 3061.

[12] C. Guo, and M. E. Davies, "Sample Distortion for Compressed Imaging," IEEE Trans. Signal Process., vol. 61, pp. 6431-6442, Dec. 2013.

[13] B. Osgood, A. Siripuram, and W. Wu, "Discrete sampling and interpolation: Universal sampling sets for discrete bandlimited spaces," IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 4176-4200, Jul. 2012.

[14] I. Shomorony and A. Salman Avestimehr, "Sampling Large Data on Graphs", GlobalSIP 2014.

[15] D. I. Shuman, S. K. Narang, P. Frossard, A. Ortega, and P. Vandergheynst, "The emerging field of signal processing on graphs: Extending high-dimensional data analysis to net- works and other irregular domains," IEEE Signal Process. Mag., vol. 30, pp. 83-98, 2013.

[16] A. Anis, A. Gadde, and A. Ortega, "Towards a sampling theorem for signals on arbitrary graphs," ICASSP, 2014.

[17] L. J. Alvarez-Vazquez, A. Martinez, M. E. Vazquez-Mendez and M. A. Vilar, "Optimal location of sampling points for river pollution control," Mathematics and Computers in Simulation, vol. 71, no. 2, pp. 149-160, Feb. 2006.

[18] R. Wang, and H. Zhang, "Optimal Sampling Points in Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces," 2012. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/ 1207.5871.

[19] S. Rajendran and K. M. Liew, "Optimal stress sampling points of plane triangular elements for patch recovery of nodal stresses" International J. for numerical methods in engineering, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 579-607, Apr. 2003.

[20] F. Marvasti, M. Analoui, and M. Gamshadzahi, "Recovery of signals from nonuniform samples using iterative methods," IEEE Trans. Signal Process., vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 872-878, Apr. 1991.

[21] R. M. Gray, *Toeplitz and circulant matrices: A review*, Now publishers Inc., 2006.

[22] R. C.Thompson, "Principal submatrices IX: Interlacing inequalities for singular values of submatrices," Linear Algebra and its Applications, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1-12, Jan. 1972.

[23] D. G. Luenberger, "Optimization by vector space methods," John Wiley & Sons, 1990.

[24] E. Carlen, "Trace inequalities and quantum entropy: an introductory course," Entropy and the quantum 529, pp. 73-140, 2010.

[25] R. Venkataramani and Y. Bresler, "Perfect reconstruction formulas and bounds on aliasing error in sub-Nyquist nonuniform sampling of multiband signals," IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 46, no. 6 , pp. 2173-2183, Jun. 2000.

[26] C. Herley and P. W. Wong, "Minimum rate sampling and reconstruction of signals with arbitrary frequency support," IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 45, no 5, pp. 1555-1564, May 1999.

[27] T. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory,* John Wiley & Sons, 2012.